

The South Atlantic Quarterly.

The Political Treatment of the Drink Evil

By JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY,

Chairman of the North Carolina Anti-Saloon League

I. EXTENT AND GRAVITY OF THE DRINK EVIL.

The most serious and extensive evil of our times in Europe and America is the drink evil—indulgence and over-indulgence in liquors that intoxicate. It is likewise the most difficult to treat, having proved so far indeed baffling. Its extent and gravity are universally recognized, but no statesman of the first order, so far as I know, has addressed himself to it; and, I think, for the reason that no satisfying and widely applicable political remedy for it—even for the civic phase of it—has been hit upon. Abraham Lincoln is frequently quoted as having said that “the next snarl”—next after slavery—“we’ve got to straighten out is the liquor question.” But slavery was limited to one section, while the drink-habit is distributed throughout our country. In fact the two evils are in no particular alike. Slavery was superficial; it could be cut off. Drink is a personal habit; it cannot be got at so easily. Slavery could be extirpated by law; the drink evil is to a degree beyond the power of legislation. The sale and manufacture of liquors may be regulated, may even be prohibited; but it is another matter to stay the personal habits of millions.

The most conservative authority, the “Committee of Fifty,”* eminent men led by Seth Low, Charles Dudley Warner, Francis G. Peabody, Charles W. Eliot, and Washington Gladden, declared after ten years of investigation that drink is the direct cause of nearly fifty per cent. of crime and of twenty-five per cent. of poverty in the United States, and other authorities reasoning from extensive investigations—notably the Massachusetts Bureau of Labor

* See *The Liquor Problem*. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

in its 26th Report—attribute to this cause nearly half the cases of insanity. While our annual drink bill, for intoxicating liquors, amounts to one billion five hundred million dollars, a sum that would build several Panama Canals, a tax of more than \$20.00 per capita on every inhabitant of the United States,* an infusion of injurious intoxicants that not only produces an army of millions of drunkards, whose death-list is 100,000 a year, but impairs the effectiveness of our industrial forces to an incalculable degree—not to mention the vast undermining of moral sense.

Even these most conservative estimates convince one at a glance that here is a field for the greatest service, that here is an evil that demands the wisest and most devoted efforts, that here is opportunity to do a larger good than can be found in any other field, that here is a task and a danger commanding every citizen's attention. As Mr. Francis G. Peabody says in the introduction to "The Liquor Problem:" "The truth on this subject is so grave and portentous that it needs no exhortation to carry an appeal to the conscience and the will. . . . Facts so prodigious should silence the sectarian controversies which divide the advocates of temperance, and should summon all intelligent citizens to the realization of a common peril and a common responsibility."

In this article I shall undertake to discuss some of the political efforts to cope with the drink evil, to indicate from American experiments—of which there have been many—the only practical and wise political method of dealing with the liquor traffic, and, finally, to set down certain conclusions in general and certain others with special reference to the present North Carolina experiment, of the wisdom of which my study and experience have convinced me.

II. ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF AGITATION AND PROTEST.

The year 1908 will mark the hundredth anniversary of the first temperance organization in the United States. I take it that the reader is tolerably familiar with the diverse forms that the temperance movement has assumed these hundred years—societies, lodges, orders, political parties, total abstiners' leagues, inter-

*See American Prohibition Year Book, 93 La Salle street, Chicago.

church (anti-saloon) leagues, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, etc.

One cannot complain that the drink evil has flourished because of popular indifference or for want of passionate opposition. No other two or three or ten evils have been the object of so many opposition movements, such widespread agitation or so passionate protest. Great orators have devoted their lives to the work of denunciation and warning; far-spreading organizations have swept the country; churches have flamed with indignant protest; the greatest petitions in history have been enrolled; four times a year all the Sunday schools that follow the almost universally accepted International Lessons have instructed their millions in the danger of drink; in a word, the American people have for a generation waged a ceaseless and uncurbed agitation on the subject.

Nevertheless the amount of intoxicating liquors consumed per capita in our country has constantly increased. I submit here some statistics, gathered from authentic records, that indicate the rate of this increase:

In 1776 the average amount of liquor drunk in one year throughout the colonies was fifty quarts per family. Thirty years later it had increased to 150 quarts per family.* In 1877 the annual consumption of intoxicating liquors was 8.33 gallons per capita—about 150 quarts. In 1887 the average was 13.99; in 1897 it was 16.22; in 1906 it was about 22 gallons per capita.†

We are not to infer, however, that the warfare against drink has been vain. We do not know what depths it has saved us from. Moreover, in recent years the industrial companies have taken steps which increasingly make for the exclusion of the drinker from the industrial domain, more particularly from railroads. And, what is of more significance, outside of our larger cities drinking no longer receives the social approval that it once did. Bishop Potter's remark that the saloon is the workingman's club, is doubtless true in a measure of the greater centres of population; but in the rest of the country the saloon cannot claim so much. Neither the workingman nor the politician can afford to make a habit of loafing in saloons. There is a sensibility

* Munsey's Magazine, August, 1905. "The Story of Temperance."

† American Prohibition Year Book.

throughout our country that bans the bar-keeper and all those who keep company with him; and there is a commercial sensitiveness which would close the door of opportunity upon the drinker before he becomes a drunkard. And there is in parents' minds a most wholesome horror of drink and the saloons. These effects of the warfare against drink are in themselves most gratifying and they give ground for far-reaching hopes.

Moreover, since 1892 there has been a significant decline in the consumption of domestic distilled spirits. In that year the average per capita consumption of domestic distilled spirits was 1.49 gallons, or 149 gallons for every hundred persons. In 1905 the average was 1.38 per capita, a reduction of eleven gallons per 100 of population in thirteen years. This decrease has been recorded in spite of the steady increase in number of gallons of intoxicating liquors consumed. The only explanation is that the popular demand is for the milder, less intoxicating drinks. This should be a source of encouragement to every advocate of temperance. To the degree that we reduce the alcohol consumed, to that degree we make for temperance and all that temperance means. I almost venture the hope that at last the tide has turned—the drunkenness and the woes of drink, thanks to a century of agitation and protest, are from now on to be a diminishing evil.

An examination of the report of the Board of Trade of Great Britain and Ireland shows that the people of the United States consume a less quantity of ardent spirits per capita than those of the United Kingdom, France or Germany. I cite this fact not only as a subject of gratification, but lest some one argue from the foregoing paragraph that we make a policy of encouraging the drinking of light wines and weak beer. France and Italy, which far surpass us in the consumption of wines, also far surpass us in the consumption of distilled spirits; and Great Britain, which surpasses us, and Germany, too, in the consumption of beer, also surpasses us in the per capita consumption of ardent spirits—though she does not surpass Germany, which nation holds the lead, according to the report I have cited, in strong drinks.

Our only policy is to maintain our zealous warfare against drink, although, as I propose to indicate, we may more wisely

direct our political efforts than we have hitherto. We may protest against misdirected or unintelligent zeal, but we are not wise to protest against the passionate indictments of an evil so ruinous and so extensive. Only let the actual work of drink come home to you, and you will gain an access of sympathy for the intemperate warrior against drink that will quite suffice. A thing so potent to ruin men and destroy homes, an enemy of welfare so persistent, requires and justifies a passionate hatred. But, of course, it is the task of the calmer spirits to wisely direct this passion.

III. POLITICAL REMEDIES.

In response to agitations, many American counties, cities and states have undertaken to eradicate this evil by political enactments. I think every plan has been tried save national prohibition—high license, low license, no license, substitutes for the saloon, local option, county prohibition, local prohibition, state prohibition, prohibition by popular vote, prohibition by statute, prohibition by constitutional amendment. The Empire of China has recently undertaken the national prohibition of the use of opium, an elaborate plan to extirpate the evil in ten years by imperial decree having been promulgated. It may be possible that such a scheme will succeed in China. But even if it should, we all know that there would be little in the success to encourage Americans. We know that our national power is not sufficient to control in local affairs—constitution or no constitution. To do so would require, not only a China-like centralization, but a China-like power to behead, and, moreover, a practical constabulary occupation of the country. So we may dismiss this delusion of the Prohibition Party, and proceed to discuss the experiments that have been tried.

A. *State Prohibition.*

It is of record that state prohibition has been tried in twenty-three states of the American Union. The state prohibition movement began in 1851. Within half a century all these states save three have abandoned state prohibition. (See American Prohibition Year Book.) This is impressive. I believe the American people are sufficiently concerned about the drink evil to support

any reasonable political scheme that will fairly curb it and give promise of gradual eradication. The fact, therefore, that twenty states have repealed their state prohibition laws, tends to convince me that state prohibition has proved ineffectual.

This is confirmed not only by the records of these states, but also by my information, the authenticity of the sources of which is not to be questioned, concerning Maine and Kansas—two far-separated and quite typical American states that have had, and now have, the strongest possible state prohibition laws, the one for fifty years the other for twenty-five years. My copy of "The American Prohibition Year Book," issued in the interest of temperance, quotes the late Sheriff Pearson—who was elected on his pledge to close the open saloons in Portland and who died a martyr to his hopeless task—as saying that there are a number of open saloons in Bangor, Maine. This notwithstanding that Maine has had state prohibition for half a century, and for much of the time constitutional prohibition. This notwithstanding that prohibition has been a vital issue in all the Maine campaigns, and that Maine's governors, senators, and representatives have stood for state prohibition. Those open saloons in Maine are monuments to the inherent American doctrine of local self-government as well as to the power of drink. Bangor chooses to have saloons, and the constitution thunders in vain.

The reader may recall the impressive reduction of the Republican majority in Maine in the election of 1906. In that campaign, while there were other issues, the Democrats kept the Republicans on the defensive as to state prohibition, and that party's loss is largely attributable to the growing opinion that state prohibition is an ineffectual method of treating the drink evil. Within five years Vermont and New Hampshire have overthrown state prohibition, after a thorough-going trial of it; and my judgment is that Maine will shortly follow their example.

With regard to Kansas I have more extensive information, and it is from the book entitled "Prohibition in Kansas," compiled by T. E. Stephens, Secretary of the Kansas State Temperance Union—the leading temperance organization in Kansas. On page eleven there is this table:

Number of Kansas cities which openly license saloons, 25;

number of Kansas cities which clandestinely license saloons or or joints, 23.

And this in the "banner prohibition state" of Kansas!

Very impressive evidence of the failure of state prohibition in Maine and Kansas is to be had in the report of the United States Revenue Department for 1905. The number of United States retail liquor dealer's stamps (licenses) issued in Maine was 1,051—one for every 700 persons; the number in North Carolina was 840—one for every 2,380 persons. Of course these Maine stamps must have been issued to a large degree to drug stores—but why should there be a drug store with a retail liquor dealer's stamp, for every 700 persons in Maine, while North Carolina has only one for every 2,380 persons? Let it be remembered that North Carolina drug stores also operate with these stamps. I can account for this excess of drug store liquor licenses in Maine in only one way—state prohibition has made liquor dealing drug stores three times as necessary in Maine as they are in North Carolina. To be sure North Carolina has a few dispensaries, about twenty; but these are not sufficient to account for so great a difference.

And as for Kansas, there are five times as many open, licensed (they pay a monthly fine) saloons in that state of constitutional prohibition, after twenty-five years of incessant agitation and the repeated election of governors pledged to enforce the law, as there are in North Carolina. The proportion of United States retail liquor dealer's stamps (generally known as federal licenses) to the population throughout the country is one stamp to 345 persons. In Kansas there is one stamp to 517 persons. In North Carolina there is one stamp to 2,380 persons—the best record of all save Mississippi. Again rises the question, Why so many more drug stores (with liquor licenses) in Kansas than in North Carolina?

The conclusion is overwhelming that state prohibition is a failure. North Carolina would be worse off with it than she is without it. She would gain nothing that she now has not; and she would lose the advantage of direct support of local prohibitory measures. I can account, therefore, for the demand in certain quarters for state prohibition only in the general ignorance of its failure wherever it has been tried. And I believe a study

of conditions in Kansas and Maine will convince the friends of temperance that we have nothing to gain by following the example of these states.

We may set down as one fact clearly established by experience that general prohibitory laws are ineffectual in cities—as indicated by open saloons in Maine and Kansas.

But there are state laws which are effectual; and we find them in North Carolina. We have in North Carolina state laws prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors everywhere save in incorporated and policed towns. That these laws have proved reasonably effectual is not to be disputed. But we have no reason to argue that such laws will make good in any other state. They are successful in North Carolina because the population approves them. Many citizens of the rural districts approve them only because they can obtain drink when they go to town. To cut off the town saloons or dispensaries would tend to make these citizens opponents of the present limited prohibitory laws instead of advocates of them. The advocate of state prohibition will be wise to weigh this assertion. For we have proceeded far enough now to say that another fact established by our American experiments in temperance legislation is—*that liquor traffic regulations can be no stronger than the local opinion will bear.*

This is measurably true of any law in a free country. The sovereign is not one, but many. The sovereign is not Congress, is not the General Assembly; the sovereign is the people—and the people are not a nation, nor a state; they are the community—the municipality. Ours is not a government of centralized powers; the power is distributed; and wherever the population is sufficiently organized to govern, there the powers of government in matters pertaining to that locality are deposited; that is to say, if the majority of voters in a city or town or county prefer saloons, they will elect officers that will not molest them, regardless of prohibitory laws. This is done regularly in Kansas, and governor after governor has failed to meet the situation. He may have the mayor indicted; but the people for that very reason re-elect that mayor. To cope with a situation of this kind would require a centralization of authority contrary to all the American precedents and really subversive of the spirit of American

institutions. Nothing short of the absolute imperialism of China would suffice—and we shall see whether even that will suffice in China. The theory of self-government is the only theory that civilized people will long tolerate; and self-government does not proceed from the national head downward; it proceeds from the local community upward.

But cannot the law be enforced? No—not when the majority—which is the sovereign in fact and in theory,—is opposed. But granting that the law cannot be enforced, shall we abandon it, therefore? Do we abandon the laws against murder or larceny because they are broken? If this argument were not so frequently used by influential advocates, I would not give it consideration here. Reasoning beings must perceive the utter weakness of it. We do hang some men for murder, and we try and punish the others. We do arrest and imprison thieves. And the public opinion firmly supports the law and requires the execution of it. But let a man open a joint in a place where the people desire a joint, and officers will not indict him until they are forced to, and when they have indicted him juries will not convict him. In Kansas they fine liquor dealers fifty dollars a month—without trial. It is of record that in Kansas saloon towns grand juries decline, as a rule, to find true bills, and when they do petty juries find the accused not guilty. Public opinion sustains our laws against murder and larceny. Those who escape are the exception, not the rule. Men do not steal in public, nor are men elected to office on a platform favorable to free murder. The factor of public opinion is the determining factor.

It is conceivable, however, that a state might measurably prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, if it were isolated—if it had power to pronounce contraband any shipment of liquor from other states. But eminent authorities hold that decisions of the Supreme Court already delivered are an insuperable obstacle here—that the right to ship liquors from one state to another for personal use is a constitutional right which no state can deny—and in view of the freedom of commerce between the states I readily incline to this view. There is now pending in Congress, however, a bill, supported by Mr. Littlefield, of Maine, and approved by the House Committee on Interstate Commerce, that would give states this power. In the former

Congress a similar bill (the Hepburn-Dolliver bill) was proposed, and its advocates—including the official representatives of the National Anti-Saloon League—accepted an amendment to it providing that it should not apply to interstate shipments of liquors for personal use. I received from the Washington legislative representatives of the Anti-Saloon League an official statement of this fact, with the statement that the amendment had been accepted because without it eminent authorities were assured that the bill would be pronounced unconstitutional as soon as it became a law.

We may at any rate regard this matter as in question and put aside all hope of effectual state prohibition until the Supreme Court renders a direct favorable decision.

B. *Local Option.*

By local option the regulation of the liquor traffic is referred directly to the electorate upon satisfactory petition—usually one-third of the qualified voters. The voting unit may be the town, the township or the county. The option may embrace, and, I think, ought to embrace under limitations which I shall tentatively indicate, licensed saloons, dispensaries and prohibition—these being the three recognized civic treatments of the liquor traffic.

The advantage of local option is that it automatically obtains the support of the majority. The governing power is direct; the voice of the sovereign is obtained. It is of the essence of self-government. Moreover, local option campaigns are educational—they arouse the people, and they place on the people the responsibility which is truly theirs. And since the option is not final, but usually is limited to two years, there is the strongest incentive to the majority to make good their choice. If they establish prohibition, they know that they must make it effectual. If they establish a dispensary, they know that they must see that it is well conducted. If they establish saloons, they know that they must be decently regulated.

It ought to be a fixed rule of American politics never to do for an organized community what it can do for itself; never to accept a responsibility which may be discharged by the electorate. This is self-government. A legislator is foolish to assume the responsi-

bility for an act that his people may conveniently pass upon. His proper duty is to concern himself with the acts of more general import and with only such local acts as are either too insignificant for popular action or that are not worth the cost of an election.

Local option is, therefore, incomparably the best means of treating the liquor traffic.

But there remains the serious question—in local option shall the voting unit be the town, the township or the county? And there is this other less serious but important question, Shall the option in all cases embrace saloons, dispensaries and prohibition?

The first question is a question wholly of preponderating interest. For example, Do saloons in Asheville, North Carolina, affect Buncombe county more than they affect Asheville, or so much that Buncombe county voters should have a voice in the option? I would say not. Asheville has a large population—about 17,000. She elects her own officers and is fully competent to govern herself. In fact no one else, either by law or opinion, can govern her. Moreover, her interests in the matter stand above the interests of the county. To permit the county to govern in the matter, say, to thrust prohibition upon Asheville, would be to invite nullification; for it will fall upon Asheville to enforce the prohibition. And I recur here to my statement that the one thing we have learned from our American experiments is that direct opinion and direct control are essential to the success of prohibitory enactments.

But there is in Buncombe county a town named Fairview—a small town. Should that town have the right to set up saloons or dispensaries? Clearly not. The preponderating interest is in the country round about. The vote on a question of this kind should be in the township; and if saloons there would affect a larger territory, that too must be considered. Again, take for example a town of 2,500 inhabitants in a county of 20,000 inhabitants. I take it that here the preponderating interest would be in the county—and would refer the option to the whole county, especially if the town is the county-seat. Otherwise, probably, to the township.

Of course it might be argued that if the law cannot be enforced upon a city of 15,000 population by a county, a county or town—

ship cannot enforce the law upon a town of 3,000 population. But I think it will be agreed that ordinarily this will not hold. Opinion would overcome the local disinclination to enforce the law.

Evidently it is necessary to draw a line determining this matter of preponderating interest. It might be done by the ratio of population; it would more wisely be done, if it were practicable, by direct testimony. But in lieu of an example of either of these methods I shall here venture a practical scheme, as follows:

Proclaim prohibition, with no option whatever in all rural districts, including towns of less than 500 population.

Allow option of prohibition or dispensary in towns of more than 500 and less than 3,000 population, giving the county the privilege of ratifying or repudiating the action of the town, if the town is the county seat, provided one-third of the qualified voters of the county (outside the town) petition for the privilege.

With regards to towns that are not county-seats apply the foregoing to the township.

Allow option of prohibition, dispensary or saloons to towns of more than 3,000 and less than 6,000 population, giving the county, upon petition of one-third of the voters (outside the town) the right to ratify or repudiate the option.

Allow option of prohibition, dispensary or saloons to cities of 6,000 or more population.

An act of this sort would relieve the General Assembly once and for all of dealing with the liquor traffic—the question would become wholly local, as it should be. It would place the responsibility where it must ultimately rest. It would bring public opinion directly to the support of the law. And, I venture, it would measurably answer the difficult question of preponderating interest.

IV. EXPERIMENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

The act of 1903 (Watts act) excluded saloons and distilleries from rural districts in North Carolina. It did not affect many saloons, as for twenty years local laws (acts incorporating churches and schoolhouses with the one object of prohibiting manufacture or sale of liquor within from three to five miles of them) had driven the saloons to the towns. But it did affect 500

distilleries, all but about fifty of which went out of business or became illicit and brought the state and federal officers into the field against them. The act of 1905 further restricted the sale of liquor by confining it not only to incorporated towns, but to incorporated towns that maintained at least two policemen—the principle of the act being that since saloons breed crime they must not exist save where police protection exists. The act went a degree farther with regard to distilleries, forbidding their existence in towns of less than 1,000 population—on the ground that distilleries were likely to be able to dominate and debauch towns of less population.

The act of 1903 also provided local option machinery for all the towns in North Carolina that did not have prohibition or dispensaries by special statute; and this local option offers choice, upon proper petition of one-third of the qualified voters, of prohibition, dispensary or saloons—the petitioners determining the alternatives.

So we have in North Carolina:

- (1). Rural prohibition by statute.
- (2). Municipal local option, under which we have prohibition, dispensaries and saloons.
- (3). Statutory prohibition in certain counties and towns. Statutory dispensaries in certain towns. Prohibition in many small towns by special provision in their charters.

It is the overwhelming opinion that this situation is satisfactory. It gives statutory prohibition where prohibition will hold; for the rest it adapts the law to public opinion. The one source of uneasiness is those towns that have special statutes which prevent local option. From them delegations come frequently to the General Assembly, because their only appeal is to that body. The remedy for this is, of course, to give them local option. There are, to be sure, many towns and counties that are content with statutory prohibition, and they resent any proposal of local option for them. This is very well. If they do not want to vote, they should not be invited to do so. But the General Assembly ought to make a rule of giving local option to these towns upon the first manifestation of intention to fight the battle over again in the General Assembly. That is not the place for final settlement of this question.

Rural prohibition has proved entirely satisfactory. Here and there a political demagogue has sought to inflame the minds of the country people with the statement that they are not allowed to vote on liquor questions. But this has had no effect, for good reasons. In the first place the country people have never been in the habit of voting on this question. In the second they are largely opposed to having wayside saloons. If they had a vote they would vote to have what they now have. They enjoy, therefore, their present immunity from those who might involve them in an election on this subject.

Local option elections have gone largely against the saloons. In one year's campaign they were closed in thirty towns and cities—Charlotte, Greensboro, Durham, Goldsboro, Elizabeth City and New Bern heading the list, with Raleigh, which substituted a dispensary for twenty-four saloons, coming second. As a result of these elections North Carolina stands second best in the United States records of liquor licenses—only one state having fewer in proportion to population. The total number of saloons in the State is about 175—my records show 162. I count 18 dispensaries in the State, with at least five others in definite prospect.

Our situation is this, therefore: We have 162 saloons in fifteen towns and 18 dispensaries in eighteen towns; and the rest of the State is under prohibition. This, as I have said, is a better record than either Kansas or Maine can show. Only 125,000 of our population of 2,000,000 live in towns that have saloons—though, of course, the saloons affect a large number. Less than 60,000 of our population live in towns that have dispensaries. More than nine-tenths of our population, therefore, live in prohibition territory.

The local dispensary, I may say here, proved at first quite popular as a means of overcoming the saloons. But within a few months two reactions have set in—one making against the dispensary, the other making for it. On one hand the prohibitionists denounce it, not only as a shameful and degrading compromise, but as an actual failure as a temperance measure. On the other, the demand for local dispensaries in prohibition towns has been gaining widely and rapidly for several months. This demand does not come from the liquor dealers. They regard

the dispensary as their worst enemy. It comes of the failure of prohibition. If under the Interstate Commerce Act large numbers of jugs are shipped into a town daily, citizens begin to say that the express office is no more than a dispensary, and we should have some means of providing police protection. Or, if drug stores and blind tigers freely ply the traffic, they ask, "Why should we not take charge of it and use the revenue to protect us from the drinkers?" And, moreover, there is a large class who value the revenue feature of the dispensary as a means of reducing the tax-rate, supporting schools, building roads and financing bond issues. They add, of course, that the dispensary is better than saloons and that it is more in accord with reasonable opinion than prohibition.

We must recognize the force of these arguments. But we should not yield to them save only where conditions are so adverse that prohibition is manifestly ineffectual. For this reason alone I advocate that the dispensary shall be one of the options in our system. I recognize the dangers of the dispensary; but I hold that it is better than saloons, and that there may be instances where it is to be preferred for a time to prohibition. It cannot be said as yet that the local dispensary has proved either a failure or a success in North Carolina. We have not tried them long enough. They are presumed to do their best work in protecting the rising generation—a protection that cannot be measured in a year or two years or in five years. They are also presumed to aid the cause of sobriety by giving the municipality control over the drink supply. But it cannot be said so far that any North Carolina town has undertaken to exercise this control. That they do destroy the power of the saloon vote is manifest. On the other hand, how far they seduce citizens with revenue, how far they compromise the moral sense of the body politic, how far they destroy the slowly acquired and magnificent opposition to the traffic in liquors,—are questions that must give us everyone gravest concern.

We are making a great experiment in North Carolina. In certain towns and counties we are trying dispensaries, in others, Charlotte, Greensboro, Durham, for example, we are trying local prohibition; in others, as Winston-Salem, Asheville and Wilmington, we have several degrees of high license. While throughout

the rural districts we have statutory prohibition. These experiments will in due time give much light to the patient student of the drink evil and its treatment. We have an abundant interest in the subject throughout the State, and I boldly hold out the hope that we shall in the not far distant future evolve a civic system that will prove a model for similarly conditioned commonwealths. We shall find out what is best to do, and finding it we shall form a uniform policy. I hold that this is an end in every respect worthy of the greatest patience and the most devoted endeavors. For the present I am convinced no better policy can be devised than our present policy of rural prohibition with municipal local option, modified as I have indicated by the operation of a rule of preponderating interest.

In conclusion let me remind the reader that the civic treatment of the drink evil can by no means suffice. We must increase the preventive measures of (1) parental exhortation, (2) day school and Sunday school instruction, (3) legal protection of minors, (4) constant exhortation and example against drinking. We must also continue to close the industrial domain to the drinker; not the drunkard, but the drinker. And we must arrive at a more effectual method of treating the drunkard—our most dangerous citizen. I have no special cure to recommend; but I do recommend that, one or more cures having been tried in vain, the State shall take charge of him and protect the society which he menaces, not to mention his more immediate need of protection from himself. There are drunkards not a few who are more dangerous than maniacs. The last testimony of the average victim of the gallows is that drink incited him to murder. To let such men go unrestrained is wholly unworthy of a civilized people.

The Practice of Lynching in the United States

By JAMES ELBERT CUTLER,*

Assistant Professor of Economics in the University of Michigan

In spite of the fact that in the United States every year men are designedly put to death in a wholly illegal and most reprehensible manner by private citizens, neither the causes of this action, nor the consequences, are widely apprehended. Comparatively few of the conservative and influential citizens realize how serious is the situation with reference to the practice of lynching persons of despicable character or heinous deed whenever extreme popular indignation is aroused against them. When a lynching occurs, extenuating circumstances are usually found, and, while the occurrence is much regretted, practically nothing is done except to consign it to oblivion as soon as may be possible. Some little endeavor may be made to discover the guilty parties and a grand jury may even bring in indictments, but commonly the verdict of the coroner's jury, to the effect that "the deceased came to his death at the hands of persons unknown to the jury," marks the end of all legal procedure with reference to the occurrence. And there is no attempt to go beyond the particular case, either to study causes or consequences. It is not known or understood, generally, how numerous are the causes and occasions of lynchings, nor how deeply rooted in our American life and spirit this practice is, on the part of private citizens, of taking the law into their own hands under any circumstances which appear to be especially exasperating. It is not possible in this connection to consider every phase of this important subject, but the history of lynching in the United States, given in outline merely, is extremely suggestive.

Very early in the history of the settlement and colonization of the territory of the United States, measures which were not wholly legal in their nature were occasionally adopted in the punishment of public offenders. During the colonial period, in

*Dr. Cutler is the author of the valuable work on "Lynch Law" which received notice in the October, 1906, number of the *QUARTERLY*.

places where the provincial governments were well organized, Indians accused of murdering whites were, upon capture, not only put to death without any legal formality whatsoever, but were, even after arrest and confinement in a perfectly legal way, sometimes forcibly taken from the officers of the law, and from jails, and mercilessly killed by private citizens. During the colonial period, also, there was recourse to the practice of "regulating" public offenders and public grievances, of inflicting, semi-privately, corporal punishment for reformatory or corrective purposes upon persons considered inimical to the interests of the community. In North Carolina, by means of a more or less formal organization of Regulators, during the years 1765-1771, resistance was offered to what were considered oppressive exactions on the part of the government officials. In South Carolina, at about the same time, in the part remote from the sea-coast, a similar organization of Regulators attempted, by whipping and banishing the undesirable inhabitants, to protect property and preserve order until an adequate judiciary could be established.

Throughout the period of the Revolutionary War conditions were such as to offer abundant opportunity for the use of extra-legal methods of punishment. There were the usual unsettled conditions and the disorganization incident to a war. Furthermore, in almost every community there were persons holding Tory sentiments who frequently sought, openly or secretly, to hinder in every possible way the successful outcome of the movement for independence. Tarring and feathering, with accompanying indignities, was the characteristic and popular method of dealing with customs informers and importers of British goods, tea consignees, and Tories in general who, by words or acts, aroused patriotic indignation. At the same time, summary punishment was not infrequently visited upon other public offenders; usually it was a coat of tar and feathers, but often it took the form of a whipping, merely, followed by banishment after a specified time. There was, in addition, an occasional infliction of the death penalty by these self-constituted administrators of law and justice during the period of the Revolution.

When the tide of emigration rolled westward over the Alleghanies, after the close of the Revolutionary War, it carried with

it the extra-legal methods of punishment adopted during colonial times and the summary practices of the time of the Revolution; and, amidst the dangers and vicissitudes of frontier life, they were revived and put into use again and again by the pioneers of the West. It is to be remembered, too, that it was mainly against white men of desperate character—highway robbers, counterfeiters, swindlers, horse-thieves, cattle-thieves, desperadoes—that these summary proceedings were invoked by the emigrants from the original colonies as they pushed the line of the frontier further and further to the westward. Generally, the punishments administered consisted of nothing more serious than a whipping, or some other form of corporal punishment. Frequent occasion was found on the frontier for the use of such methods to curb the activity of the lawless and the vicious. During the colonization of the territory west of the Mississippi River, however, more extreme measures were commonly taken. In the fifties, particularly, the punishment inflicted by the "vigilance" organizations which were then common in that section of the country was, almost invariably, death by either hanging or shooting.

Not long after the year 1830, when the slavery controversy began to stir up much animosity and dissension, popular suspicion was directed particularly against the abolitionist. Since the abolitionist advocated the liberation of the slaves and worked zealously toward that end, he was declared to be undermining the right of private property, to be attempting to overthrow the established order of society. This seemed to many people ample justification for summary punishment. In the slave states such punishment was generally a whipping or flogging, which was often followed by tarring and feathering, and banishment after a few hours, with a penalty of like treatment or worse for non-compliance.

In cases of suspected conspiracy for an insurrection among the slaves the supposed leaders were often summarily punished, sometimes by the infliction of the death penalty. But previous to the abolition of slavery in the United States comparatively few negroes were put to death in any other than a perfectly legal manner. The fact that the slaves were property, and in that capacity were amenable to the laws, made recourse to unlawful procedure against them unprofitable, as well as unnecessary.

After the close of the Civil War, however, when the negroes had ceased to be chattels and the whites were threatened with negro domination, summary methods were widely adopted against the negroes. Indeed, to so great an extent have extra-legal methods of punishment been followed, throughout the Reconstruction Period and subsequently, in dealing with negroes accused of crime, that the word *lynching* is now associated in the minds of many people almost exclusively with the killing of *negroes* in a summary fashion.

It will be seen that numerous conditions and circumstances have combined to breed in the American people a traditional inclination to disregard, upon occasion, all the law and legal procedure that have been established. For no considerable period of time since the early settlement of this country can it be said that extra-legal methods of punishing crime have been wholly unknown. From colonial times down to the present day, in some one or more parts of the country, frontier conditions have existed where the civil regulations were not sufficiently established to insure the prompt and effective punishment of public offenders. At the same time, in the older, better settled sections of the country, though the judiciary was well established and the apprehension and punishment of public offenders was well provided for in the law, circumstances have arisen, time after time, of such a nature that the regular and legal administration of justice was deemed inadequate or defective, and was therefore disregarded. The resourceful, self-reliant spirit necessarily possessed by the early settlers and the western pioneers, combined with the turbulent, rebellious and seditious elements which the Revolution set loose, have, under varying circumstances, borne fruit a hundredfold throughout the subsequent history of the growth, expansion and development of this country.

In the last few years, most of the writers who have discussed the lynchings that have occurred, have attributed them to race prejudice and the uncontrollable actions of crowds or mobs. Not all lynchings can be attributed to either of these causes, however. In the lynching of 1,169 whites during the twenty-two years, 1882-1903, no trace of race prejudice can be discerned. Neither is it possible to discover in the manner in which many lynchings are carried on any of the characteristics essentially belonging to

the psychology of the crowd or the mob. It is true that in numerous particular instances race prejudice appears as the most prominent inciting cause and that in many cases, also, individuals seem to lose their identity for the time being in an excited crowd where impulse controls rather than reason and intelligence, and men who are ordinarily law-abiding citizens unhesitatingly disregard all that the law guarantees to men accused of crime; but an explanation along either of these lines is wholly inadequate for a proper understanding of the existence of lynching as an American practice.

Neither can any single crime be assigned as the cause of lynchings, so that it would be safe to say that were the crime no longer committed lynchings would cease. The men and women who were lynched during the twenty-two years, 1882-1903—more than 3,300 by actual count—were charged, not with a single crime or set of crimes, but with almost every variety of offense from most brutal and inhuman murder down to mere obnoxiousness. Of the negro men who were lynched during this period not more than thirty-four per cent. were lynched for the crime of rape against white women, and this percentage includes all cases where this crime was merely alleged to be the cause of the lynching as well as all cases where there was unquestioned evidence that this crime had been attempted or actually committed by the individual who was lynched.

It will be found, if the history of the practice of lynching in this country be carefully noted, that the only contributory factor that is always and invariably present is an unorganized or disorganized state of society, or a condition of popular excitement and resentment, when reliance on ordinary legal procedure is at a minimum. Lynchings take place, primarily, because certain of the citizens conceive that the ends of justice and order can be better served in that way than by the legal procedure which is available. No punishment is given the lynchers, ordinarily, for the reason that a majority of the rest of the citizens believe that the victim or victims suffered only what was really deserved, and, while they deprecate the method adopted, it is not in accord with their sense of justice to impose a penalty upon assistance given in the infliction of a deserved punishment, even though the majesty of the law and the government has been temporarily set

at naught. That lynching, though it may be the infliction of a deserved punishment, is at the same time and must always be a serious crime against society and against all that a stable government guarantees its citizens, is commonly overlooked and practically disregarded. What is conceived to be the badness of the victim completely overshadows the direct violation of all the standards of justice and of punishment to which civilization has given its sanction.

This failure on the part of the American people to view the practice of lynching in both, as well as one, of its important aspects is peculiarly significant when it is coupled with a fact long recognized by students of political science. It is precisely under a democratic form of government, where the people, either directly or through their representatives, make the laws and then elect the officers who are to enforce them, that it is most difficult to establish a legal system capable of controlling popular excitements. A highly decentralized government, a government that grants a large degree of autonomy to its local units and at the same time gives them full representative power in national affairs, is far less effective in organizing and administering that coercive force, that compulsion and overpowering authority, which is indispensable for insuring domestic peace and for which there is no substitute in the suppression of rioting and mob violence, when unusual or exasperating circumstances arise. That this fundamental principle of political science should not have been more widely recognized by the citizens of the United States is extremely unfortunate. It is certain that too great reliance has been placed upon the freedom and self-direction of a democratic form of government and far too little recognition given to the necessity of training a vigilant and responsible citizenship which shall insist, upon all occasions and under all circumstances, that the government—federal, state, city, county, town and village—be thoroughly and effectively administered.

Administratively, the weakness of the government of the United States is shown no more clearly than in connection with the inability of the federal government to stamp out the practice of lynching. During the last twenty years the federal government, through its Department of State, has paid to foreign countries over \$400,000 in the form of indemnities for the lynching of aliens

in this country; yet it cannot in the several states legally undertake to prevent the occurrence of lynchings, nor can it in any way hold the state governments responsible, after lynchings have occurred within their boundaries, for any obligations to foreign countries, which the Department of State feels bound to recognize. Neither has the criminal prosecution of lynchers been held to be within the jurisdiction of federal authority. It was a decision without precedent when, a short time ago, United States Judge Thomas G. Jones, in Alabama, held a member of a lynching mob liable under the Fourteenth Amendment and Section 5508 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. Never before had this principle been advanced by the judiciary, that those who lynch a prisoner while in the custody of the state's officers are liable to punishment within the jurisdiction of the United States courts. Though it is a part of the fundamental law of the country that "no person . . . shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law" (Constitution, Amendment V), and that "no State . . . shall deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws" (Amendment XIV), the first and only case of lynching which has come directly within the jurisdiction of federal authority occurred last March at Chattanooga, Tennessee. Ed Johnson, a negro, following trial, conviction and sentence for criminal assault, was granted a stay of execution by the United States Supreme Court until an appeal for a writ of *habeas corpus* could be inquired into, and then, while in the custody of this court, was forcibly taken from jail by private citizens and hanged. The circumstances in this case were exceptional. On the whole, there is but little basis for a reliance upon the exercise of federal authority to suppress lynchings.

If our form of government were other than it is, perhaps appeal might properly be made to the central and highest authority. It is safe to say that if a strong monarchical government were established in this country it would be comparatively easy to find a remedy for lynching. An edict by the monarch for the better enforcement of the law, for increased activity in the direction of detecting and punishing crime as well as preventing its commission, would undoubtedly put an end to the practice of lynching. All of our political traditions are, however, utterly

opposed to a monarchy or a highly centralized form of government. Neighbors and friends become, by election for short terms of office, not only legislators, but officers whose duty it is to enforce the laws enacted—constables, sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys, magistrates and judges—and the movement of public sentiment in the local communities must, therefore, vitally affect the working of the legal system. The officers of the law whose duty it is to take charge of and protect prisoners, in accordance with the orders of the courts, consider themselves responsible, not merely to their superior officers, but responsible more or less directly to the people, their constituency, and they are, also, usually in close sympathy with that popular justification which is the *sine qua non* of lynching. Sheriffs and jailers fail to protect prisoners from mob violence, not because they generally lack either courage or power, but because they sympathize with the sentiment in the community, which demands a summary punishment that shall be fitted, in some measure, to what is conceived to be the enormity of the crime committed and the depravity of the accused.

Shall lynchings continue, therefore? What the answer is to be depends ultimately, and indeed primarily, upon the character and the quality of the American citizenship that is being developed. Enough has already been said to indicate how little is to be gained, in this country, from prohibitive legal enactments which have no effective public sentiment behind them. The results actually obtained under the anti-lynching statutes adopted thus far bear this out. Ten states have upon their statute-books measures directed specifically against lynching. Most of these measures have remained entirely inoperative. The few that have received an attempted enforcement do not inspire confidence in their efficacy. The course taken by the debate, in the 57th Congress of the United States, on a proposed inquiry into the subject of lynching, is fairly conclusive evidence that no federal action can be taken on the subject without reviving the sectionalism and many of the evils of the Reconstruction Period. However much we may regret the fact and however reluctant we may be to face the situation, it must be admitted that there is no panacea for the practice of lynching. The history of the practice shows

how deeply it is rooted in American life and tradition, and in how far, also, it is a matter that is controlled by public sentiment.

The conclusion is therefore forced upon us that nothing can, under the limitation of our form of government, effectually stop lynchings except a radical change in public sentiment. A lynching is best defined as a summary and illegal execution at the hands of a mob, or a number of persons, who have in some degree the public opinion of the community behind them. The support of public opinion is what distinguishes lynching, on the one hand, from assassination and murder, and, on the other hand, from insurrection and open warfare. Upon American citizenship rests the responsibility of withdrawing this popular support and justification without which the practice of lynching cannot exist.

There is an opinion, widely held at the present time, that a "right to lynch" exists, a right which is closely akin to the right of self-defense. The argument seems to run in this way. If it is justifiable, by the right of self-defense, for a husband to take the life of an assailant who threatens his wife, or for a parent to commit murder in the defense of his child, it is equally justifiable for the neighbors and friends of a man who has been murdered, or whose wife or daughter has been criminally assaulted, wantonly and brutally, by some individual of bad reputation, to take the life of that individual in a summary fashion with only the merest semblance of judicial procedure. Lynching is regarded as a crime only in the sense that it is a crime against the individual lynched and, as the individual in question is of no consequence, the crime of lynching is of no consequence. This belief in a right to lynch affords some explanation of the fact that lynchers, so far, ordinarily, from suffering any legal penalty for their crime, rarely even lose caste or character in the communities in which they live.

The facts in regard to the practice of lynching, its history and its alleged justification, must be known. No one should deceive himself by thinking that because, for the last two or three years, a smaller number of lynchings has been recorded annually than for several preceding years, the practice is likely soon to be discontinued altogether. As long as there is a "race problem" in this country, frequent occasion will certainly be found for a recourse to summary procedure, for which it will be comparatively easy

to secure a measure of popular justification. Only an aroused public sentiment, condemnatory to the last degree, formed on the widest possible knowledge and intelligence, and actively manifested with the utmost wisdom and foresight under trying circumstances, can enable the American people to blot out what has rightly been called their national crime.

Shall the United States enter a protest against massacres in Armenia, or in Russia, or against butcheries in Central Africa, or the Philippines? By all means. But the American people should not forget that fully 3,500 residents of the United States have been put to death, since the year 1880, by violent and wholly illegal methods. Some of these victims suffered extreme torture before death came to their relief, and their sufferings were witnessed by crowds in which were women and children. In the period 1891-1904, it is on record that 25 persons were lynched by burning alive, some of them under circumstances too horrible to contemplate. All of these victims of burning alive, during this period, were negroes, with the exception of two who were Indians, and one of the negroes was a woman. Possibly these individuals were, every one, worthless wretches and the perpetrators of most despicable crimes, but no matter how great the depravity of the accused or how atrocious the crimes committed, this country cannot afford to allow suspected criminals to be dealt with after such a fashion.

The Value of Agricultural Instruction in the Secondary Schools

BY S. A. KNAPP,

Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture

The thoughtful people of our country have become alarmed at the rapid increase of municipal wealth as compared with that of the rural districts upon which the cities depend for support. It is not alone the aggregation of great wealth and population in a few chief centres of trade, but the rapid transfer of national influence and political power from the home making and liberty loving democracy of our rural domains to the urban centres where the few are dominant. A large proportion of the vast wealth created annually from the soil, ultimately enriches the city, instead of developing and improving the resources of the country. The enormous sums paid by the farmers for transportation and for other public utilities, for insurance of all kinds, for clothing and for manufactures, all find their way into city coffers, and finally the moiety of money left the farmer from a year of toil is taken to a city bank and deposited for safe keeping. It is not, however, the rapid transfer of wealth from the country to the city that causes this great alarm: it is the almost universal removal of the leaders of men and the captains of industry from the country to the city. This disorganizes and cripples the country, weakens its effective forces and lowers its civilization.

Realizing what must be the effect upon our national life, if this is allowed to continue, patriotic men everywhere are attempting to provide a remedy. Just at present a remedy quite generally accepted is the giving of instruction in agriculture in the secondary schools. Let us weigh the reasons assigned for the addition of the study of agriculture to the high school curriculum.

First, it is claimed that instruction in agriculture will promote, and possibly create, a love for the soil, and the things it produces, and give to the pupil a tendency to the life on the farm. There may be a little of truth in this, but not much. All studies in the secondary schools are largely elementary, and are expected only

to prepare the student for wider investigations in the future and are scarcely carried far enough to create tendencies. If they give direction, as a whole they point so many different ways that one counterbalances the others. A love for the soil is not created or enhanced by the study of a book on agriculture, or any pedagogic lessons in soil manipulation. It is founded on an intelligent and successful farm life and on the environments of an orderly and thrifty country home. The pupil at this stage is not thinking about tendencies any more than the nursing child thinks about growing. He is simply developing. The factors which determine our ultimate choice of farm life are rarely scholastic tendencies, but matter of fact business relations or opportunities. It is doubtful whether the knowledge acquired in the high schools would be an influential factor in determining the choice of a rural life once in a thousand instances.

We are liable to the same erroneous conclusions here that were entertained towards agricultural colleges, and were influential in establishing them, to-wit, that they would lead to the choice of a rural occupation and promote a higher life upon the farm. Agricultural colleges have done a great work and will ultimately become more useful to the world, but if they have been influential in directing the sons and daughters of the farmers to the farm or have exerted their educational forces to increase the number of practical farmers, it is not generally known. They have been even more potent than the universities in transferring bright young men from the farms to other vocations.

The second reason offered is that such instruction will make better and more successful farmers. Such assertions arise from a complete misapprehension of what the science of agriculture is. It is entirely distinct from botany, chemistry and the sciences related to it. As a science it has to do with the organic conditions and manipulations of soils, how to feed them with plant food and fertilizers. It deals with the propagation of plants and the best methods of promoting their growth, with the selection, preservation and germination of seeds, with pomology, entomology, animal husbandry and kindred subjects. A man may be well versed in all the sciences that relate to agriculture and be master of the things I have enumerated as belonging to agriculture, and yet be a failure as a farmer. There is a business side to farming and it

is the most important part—how to plan the work and use the labor and teams to the greatest profit, how to economize in purchases and improve the farm to advantage. The schools unfortunately do not teach how to turn out at four in the morning and drive business relentlessly till the dusk calls to rest. The most failures in farming are on the business side and not on the scientific side. In the past three years I have been in close touch with over ten thousand of the best Southern farmers and know the causes of their success on the farm. The notably superior and successful farmers are universally good business men, and generally graduates of the common schools. I do not recall a single graduate of an agricultural college or a university, in the first rank. The thoroughly trained business man with tireless energy and habits of order and thrift, who has been raised on the farm, can, upon return to it, acquire the sciences applicable to his profession much more readily than the college trained man versed in science can master the business side of agriculture. Do not understand me as belittling the sciences, or attempting to dwarf the advantages of college education. I am speaking only of the relative advantages of business training and habits compared with scientific knowledge in promoting success upon the farm. The acquiring of agriculture,—which is a compound of the following ingredients: one-eighth science, three-eighths art, and one-half business methods,—out of a book, is like reading up on the hand-saw and jack plane and hiring out for a carpenter.

The average farmer does not keep any book account with his crops and does not know exactly where to place his losses or gains. In our co-operative demonstration work we require detailed crop accounts. In the fall of 1905 one of our Texas co-operative farmers came to our Houston office greatly perplexed. He said to our traveling agent for his district: "I want you to go over my figures on my cotton crop. They show that I have cleared \$19.50 per acre, above all costs. This is impossible; there must be some mistake." When our agent had gone over the computation and assured him it was correct, he seemed greatly excited and said: "Well, I am an idiot. I knew that I had made some money, but did not know just what crop made it. For two years I have been offered a quarter section of prairie land adjoining my farm for \$15 per acre. Every acre of that land will produce a

bale of cotton annually and I could pay for the farm out of the first crop and have money left. Why haven't I done it? Because I did not know how to figure. You have taught me and now I will buy. Do you suppose that farm will be sold before I get home?" And he walked the floor in nervous anxiety till the train time. Today he owns the farm and paid for it out of the profits on this season's cotton crop.

The most gratifying feature of our Farmers' Coöperative Farm Demonstration Work is that wage-earners upon the farm have become scarce. Farm laborers are demanding a share of the crop and the share workers are quite generally buying farms and paying cash prices.

A third reason is frequently given for teaching agriculture in the secondary schools, and this is that it will promote a wide diversification upon Southern farms and be the means of establishing profitable crop rotations, dairying and animal husbandry in general.

In cotton and rice the South has two of the most profitable crops in the world. Our position is that it is better to go directly to the farmers and show them how to make maximum crops of these staples and still improve the fertility of their soils, than to attempt by an indirect process to influence them to diversify and go into lines of farming that will not pay half as well. I have hundreds of farmers who have cleared above all expenses over \$40.00 per acre on cotton this season, and under boll weevil conditions. It is a little difficult to persuade these men to change their methods and go into a line of farming that, at best, will pay them only five to seven dollars per acre net. Hence it is best to diversify with cotton and not by abandoning it.

It may be inferred from the foregoing that I am opposed to the teaching of agriculture in the schools. I am not, but most emphatically favor it to the extent that it can be taught successfully. I am opposed to faulty reasons for introducing it. There is one reason that I accept, and it is sufficient. It is that some knowledge of agriculture belongs to the equipment essential to a reasonably broad education, even a common school education. Botany and chemistry are taught in the secondary schools, not because the average pupil expects to be a botanist or chemist, or even to use them very much in practical life, but because they

deal with the things about us, and explain them. Not to know something of these branches is to be considered ignorant.

Just so the domain with which agriculture deals is all about us. More than half our population reside in the country. The material of which our homes are constructed, our food and our clothing are all of country origin and related to agriculture. Not to know something about the history and management of soils, plants and domestic animals, is dense and unpardonable ignorance. Agriculture ranks with algebra and geometry, with geography, history, and the sciences as among the common things that ought to be known as far as they can be through the limited instruction given in the secondary schools; and in my opinion agriculture is the most practical and important of all the branches with which I have above grouped it.

The only question to be considered here is to what extent can it be practically or profitably taught in the secondary schools? How can it be safely injected into an overcrowded curriculum without doing injury to the other important branches of learning?

A few weeks since the president of a school board in an important interior city called me in conference to discuss a course in agriculture for the high schools of his city. His tentative plan was to give full courses of instruction in practical agriculture, horticulture, and animal husbandry. For laboratory work he would purchase a farm of from 50 to 100 acres adjacent to the city, lay out the farming land into plats and small fields for tillage; purchase a small herd of choice animals, representative of the different breeds, and have swine, sheep and poultry departments. "Do you know anything about stock?" I asked. He replied in the negative. "Have you any live-stock experts among your teachers?" He answered "No." "Then," said I to him, "eliminate animal industry from your course. It would be a failure even if you had experts, for you could not keep animals and handle them in a practical way, and hence all your teaching and demonstration would lead to error. Eliminate also general farming, because this is largely made up of economical practices, which lead to certain results. A town farm, and especially a farm owned by the public, can never be economical. It might be heathful because the public would laugh at it." I pointed out that some things could be done in the way of profitable instruc-

tion. A knowledge of how plants feed and grow, the effect of root and top pruning, what changes are brought about by deeper plowing and more frequent stirring of the soil, the amount of moisture it should contain and the effect of increase of temperature, the depth at which various seeds should be planted and cultivated to secure the best results, practical information about plants, their profitable productive and economic uses could be imparted. Soil exhaustion, the use of winter cover crops, the effect of crop rotation, the advantage of using manures and fertilizers could easily be brought into the lines of investigation.

The birds, the animal and the insect pests of the barn deserve careful attention. The common woods of the country and their economic uses, and the different methods of preserving them should have a place in the secondary studies. Closely allied to agriculture are some of the mechanic arts. Elementary training in the use of tools and the construction of farm buildings is a strong factor in the successful farmer. If at such times as his farm work is not pressing he can make his improvements and construct buildings, it decreases expenses and improves efficiency. Much the larger part of our usable knowledge is acquired by indirection through the world's object lessons. If measured by their usefulness in life the most valuable half of our education is rarely touched in the school room for secondary education, to-wit: agriculture, horticulture, farm mechanics, and economics and business methods as applied to the farm. It is objected that these things can be acquired at home. No. Under present conditions they cannot be, and certainly they have not been and that is just what is troubling American farmers to-day. So history, mathematics and the sciences might be taught at home. They are not, because at the majority of homes they are not understood. It is equally true that at most farm homes the industrial and economic sciences necessary to the farmer are not understood. Agriculture in most sections consists simply in a series of motions inherited from Adam.

What has been stated in regard to the requirements for men, should be equally emphasized about those for women. No young woman is quite half educated who is not a post-graduate in household economy, especially in preparing the food needful for the farmer, in making and repairing the clothing, in the orderly

arrangement of the household, in the laws of health and care of the sick, in the management of the domestic fowls and in the knowledge of the trees and plants required for useful or ornamental purposes. These ought to be acquired at home, but they are not, and at most homes can not be in a high degree. Shall the young men and young women go out into life half educated and half equipped for duty?

The paramount question is: How can so many branches be thrust into the curriculum of the secondary schools? Can any that are now accepted and in place be eliminated? If the secondary schools are to remain the great training schools for elementary teachers and to prepare the large majority of men and women for the various vocations of life, then the curriculum should rather be strengthened than weakened, in every division. There is no room in the schools of elementary equipment, and, if there was, the pupils are scarcely prepared to acquire agriculture, and the teachers are not equipped to impart the instruction.

If there is no time for agriculture in the secondary schools as at present organized and no material reduction can be made in the time devoted to the present lines of study, what can be done? I suggest the following plan for consideration: Increase the period for holding the school one hour daily, and devote this hour and half a day on Saturday to agriculture and kindred studies, not now taught. At once I hear the objections that the teachers and pupils are taxed to their full capacity at present. Allow me to explain: There should be no books in this added work. All the knowledge should filter into the pupil by absorption, through object and doing-lessons in the open air. Hence, they should be restful and invigorating. It is too common an American opinion that restful exercises consist in engaging in some physical folly that has no useful purpose. All such theories have their baneful effect on American character. Manly exercises without useful accomplishment are like the art of talking without meaning anything. All manly exercises should have a definite purpose and accomplish something useful to the world.

An hour devoted to agriculture in a field laboratory after a day in the school room would be restful as well as instructive. During the day these field lessons should be prepared by the instructors

in agriculture, just as the apparatus is prepared and the problems assigned for the day to each student in a chemical laboratory. Some pupils would work with the soil to determine the relative value of deep and shallow tillage and the percentage of gain by frequent and thorough cultivation; others would deal with moisture in the soil, and note the effect on plants from insufficient, sufficient and superabundant moisture, the effect of temperature in soils, or of fertilizers upon the soils and how to apply them; the propagation of good seeds, their preservation and their value in the crop. There are almost endless problems along this line, all of which stand for millions of loss or gains to the farmers. How plants feed, and how plants grow, furnish many lessons; what effect root pruning has upon the top, or top pruning upon the root, what causes them to sulk and pout, or turn pale and refuse to grow. Others spend the hour among the flowering plants and shrubs, and learn what marvels of beauty can emanate from shrunken seeds; others are among the plants and trees that yield the luscious fruits and still others are busy with the forest trees that furnish the useful woods. In cold or stormy weather the shops should be open with simple tools and lessons in their use. For the girls there should be an opportunity to acquire some knowledge of housekeeping and all the things that can be transferred to the home to elevate it and make life more enjoyable.

There is nothing new in these suggestions. Hundreds have made the same before. Where we differ is that they end in these instructions with the lesson book and object lessons. These are not sufficient. Agriculture cannot be acquired from a book nor from object lessons. Those may be illustrative and helpful, but are insufficient. Instead of object lessons where the teacher demonstrates and explains, there must be doing-lessons where the pupil demonstrates by his own labor. Instead of plats, a few feet square as object lessons. These plats should be small fields, each boy owning and working one just large enough to illustrate all the problems, but not so large but that he can work it easily and thoroughly. Let each pupil understand that whatever is produced upon his little farm belongs to him and he can sell it whenever it matures. Furnish the boys excellent seed, such as their parents will desire for planting on the farm. Encourage the girls to transfer the choice plants to their homes to beautify them.

In the rural towns I am in favor of increasing the school hours upon the above plans. Town leisure for boys and girls is doing more to undermine the youth of the land than any other single cause. In the rural districts it may not be practical to increase the hours. If not, reduce the hours for other branches and substitute practical studies. Give the pupils an opportunity to absorb something useful instead of the absorption of the vicious that is now going on. I am a strong believer in education by absorption, but the environments must be adjusted, so that contact is had with the pure and the useful and the needful for uplifting. Our schools have not gone far enough in the villages and minor cities, where the environment for youth is worse than in the large cities. In the towns eight hours are taken for sleep, eight hours for school and eight hours for environment instruction. What is this environment instruction? In the main it is the games, the streets, the saloons and the sensational daily papers, nothing practical, nothing useful. Good people have been trying to remedy this by establishing high grade reading rooms and Young Men's Christian Associations. These are palliative but not remedial. Secondary schools should immediately prepare to instruct in the common and useful things of life, with the intent to impart knowledge, inspire a love of industry and lessen the hours of idleness with the added object of making men with sinews of steel and of pure and masterful character.

In the country, some modification of our common school system in the South is imperatively necessary, owing to the two races. The township graded school must take the place of the present scattered and unsatisfactory district schools. With this change it will be possible to establish a secondary high school in the country; and if farm boys are to be retained in the country and follow the life of farmers, their education should begin and terminate in the country and they should never be subjected to the influences of town life. Country high schools will be an important factor in this great work. On the farms we are not confronted with eight hours of idleness. The demonstration plats at the schools can be smaller, for country pupils may have their main demonstration plats at home, which should be regularly inspected by the teacher. The lessons in domestic science should be such as are directly applicable to the farm; the better home

should be the farm home. The better cooking should be the simple, homely but nourishing dishes of the farm.

I recall an instance where an effort was made years since to establish a school of domestic economy in connection with an agricultural college. The lady in charge made a preliminary report, by items, showing that it would be necessary to expend twelve hundred dollars for kitchen equipments. The sample foods she expected to prepare to demonstrate her work, could only be afforded by the rich and if eaten regularly would kill a bear. Plain sensible women who understand the requirements of rural homes, should be placed in charge of domestic economy instruction. Such a woman in every township could be of great help to the people. While she lectured to the pupils about foods and clothing and the laws of health, she could be the means of infinite good to the farm homes by suggestion and direction.

It may be objected that this plan cannot be put into execution for the reasons: First, the teachers qualified for such instruction cannot be found. They never will be found till there is a definite demand made for them. The agricultural colleges are well equipped for such work. Our people would easily meet this emergency. Second, it is too expensive. If the district schools were all consolidated into a township school, a teacher for practical agriculture and farm mechanics, and one for household sciences could be added without increasing the present taxation. Third, the people do not want it. They would not listen to lessons in school house cooking and receipts for caring for a family. They will give heed if anything is offered worthy of attention. The farmers of the South have in the main held to the farm methods of past centuries, without progress and with slight variation.

The Mexican boll weevil came and many of the best planters in the South predicted the speedy ruin of the cotton industry. Three years since, the United States Bureau of Plant Industry opened a campaign to make cotton despite the ravages of the weevil. The farmers gave heed and this year Texas has made the largest crop of cotton in her history with countless boll weevils present in nearly every county.

A single instance to illustrate: Last month the citizens of Smith County, Texas, invited me to address a meeting of farmers

at Tyler, the county seat. At the close of the meeting a business session was called and a unanimous request was made for more work. They wanted 150 demonstration farms and one seed farm established in that county. When told that we had no funds for such intensive work, they subscribed the amount required in fifteen minutes and the work was commenced the next day. It has now proceeded so far that without question two seed farms and 200 demonstration farms will be established within the next thirty days in Smith County. Already men who had offered their farms for sale have withdrawn them and propose to hold and improve them. They believe lands are more valuable among such people—and they are.

To review: It is my judgment that, if agriculture should be added to the curriculum of the secondary schools in the text-book form only, it would be more injurious than beneficial.

That if taught by object lessons solely, the advantages would be very slight.

That if taught by demonstration, each pupil being the demonstrator, and working out the problems on a little farm under his exclusive control, rewarded by the success and the sale of the proceeds, it would be of great value.

An opportunity should be afforded for learning how to use tools, construct farm buildings and repair machinery.

Equal facilities should be afforded girls in the lines that will fit them to take charge of households.

Every lesson taught in the school should be immediately applied to the farm and the home.

Upon the revival of letters, at the close of the Middle Ages, it was thought that education was for the few and should be limited mainly to the classics, mathematics and logic. It required centuries before modern languages and sciences were admitted upon an equality, and schools made the rightful heritage of all. Now the battle is for a recognition of industrial education in the people's schools.

The final reason I offer for its admission, is that it is a national necessity. The great battles of the future will be industrial battles. England, Germany, France, Japan and the United States are putting forth every effort to gain industrial advantage. At present, the other nations excel us in industry; we are superior in

inventive genius and machinery. When our machinery is combined with their superior industry,—what then? Recently there was some discussion about the armies and navy of Japan. I have no fear of Japan equipped for war; but I do fear industrial Japan, where every child is a natural mechanic and farmer and delights in toil, where every woman is personified skill and every man a past master of industry. Today they are poor,—in a generation they will be rich and dominate the trade of the Orient. If by any process of training, it matters not how costly, we could implant in the American youth a universal love of industry and a universal knowledge of agriculture and the mechanical arts, these would blend with our native genius, skill and ability to equip us for masterful things, and Americans would become the industrial arbiters of the world.

Religion in Science*

BY WILLIAM LOUIS POTEAT,

President and Professor of Biology in Wake Forest College

The invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity.—*Paul, Letter to the Romans.*

How is it possible that a state or a house cannot endure, no, not for the shortest time without a governor and overseer, but this so great and fair fabric should be guided thus orderly by chance and accident? There is, then, one who governs.—*Epictetus, Dissertations.*

It is true that a little Philosophy inclineth Mans Mindes to *Atheisme*; But depth in Philosophy bringeth Mens Mindes about to *Religion*: For while the Minde of Man looketh upon Second Causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and goe no further: But when it beholdeth the chaine of them, Confederate and Linked together, it must needs flie to *Providence* and *Deitie*.—*Bacon, Essays, "Of Atheisme."*

Professor Huxley, on the occasion of receiving a public distinction, told a story of a member of the Society of Friends in the old pirate days. The lover of peace was a passenger on a ship which was threatened by a pirate ship. When the captain handed him a pike that he might take part in the common defence, he declined, though he was not unwilling to stand at the gangway and wait with the pike in his hand. When the pirates actually began to come on board, he pushed the sharp end of his pike into them, with the benevolent advice to each one, "Stay on thine own ship, friend."

In view of our last discussion and of that which is now proposed, the question may be asked, Are we not inviting trouble by mixing up the crews of two distinct and hostile ships? Does not reason say to faith, with the pike at her breast, "Stay on thine own ship, friend?" And is not faith equally concerned that reason stay on board its own ship? This question of distinct spheres has been heretofore touched upon incidentally. We must now consider it more directly.

As was remarked before, the view is widely held. Dr. Osler, for

*The concluding lecture of a series given on the Brooks Foundation in Hamilton Theological Seminary, May, 1905, and repeated the following autumn in Crozer, Newton, and Rochester Theological Seminaries and the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. The general subject of the series was "The Relations of Science and Religion." The lecture is presented here unchanged.

example, told the medical students of Toronto University some eighteen months ago that they would all sooner or later come to the point where they would try "to mix the waters of science with the oil of faith." He said they could have a great deal of both, if they could only keep them separate; that the worry came from the attempt at mixture.* Dr. Brinton declares that religion and science arise in totally different tracts of the human mind, science from the conscious, religion from the sub- or unconscious intelligence, and that, therefore, there is no common measure between them.† We have noted, in the personal experience of a biologist and of a critic of our time, how these two powers of the mind presented themselves concretely in irreconcilable opposition, with different practical results. In the one case, a *modus vivendi* was established; in the other, faith with some protest, surrendered itself to the mastery of the rational faculty.

The same antithesis appears in Tennyson:

If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
I heard a voice 'believe no more,'
And heard an ever breaking shore
That tumbled in the Godless deep;
A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stood up and answered, 'I have felt!'
No, like a child in doubt and fear:
But that blind clamor made me wise;
Then was I as a child that cries,
But, crying, knows his father near.

This blind clamor of heart and head has served the useful purpose of bringing into clear relief the distinction between faith and belief, a distinction of great practical importance. Faith is seen to be of the essence of religion, belief concerns the form of it. Faith is the spirit's attitude of response to the unseen world, belief is the mind's assent to propositions about it. Faith, whose stages and processes escape logical manipulation, is said to be the gift of God; belief is a state of mind reached automatically in the presence of a body of evidence, and cannot, therefore,

*Johns Hopkins Univ. Circulars, Jan., 1904.

†Relig. of Prim. People, p. 381.

be enjoined as a duty. Consequently, faith does not have to wait for the settlement of the mind's perplexities, and the odium and the distress of religious doubt are not permitted to shadow the clearness of the heart's response to the divine appeal, which is the real test of the religious experience.

And yet, widespread and useful as the separation of the faith function and the rational function has been, I beg to remind you that faith and reason are powers of the same mind. Their strife is a civil strife. I am told that the old "faculty psychology," which treated mind as a sort of parliament of powers under the presidency of the will, is completely superseded. The mind is a unit and acts as a unit, when it acts at all. Moreover, reason is no more characteristic of mind than is will, which includes impulse, desire, and instinct, and is close akin to the operation which we name faith. Indeed, will is held by some psychologists to be the more characteristic action, intellect being the expression of will. If, now, we have learned thoroughly the lesson which Horace Bushnell taught nearly fifty years ago, and have ceased to set over against each other the natural and the supernatural as mutually exclusive; if we extend the natural to embrace the supernatural and enthrone God over all, so that as Dante has it, "that Emperor who reigns above rules in all parts," then the realm of nature becomes one to its farthest confines, and the same mental powers bring us into relation with all its provinces. The apprehending faculty we call reason when it works under the relations of time and space or elaborates the sense-given ideas of the material world. We call it faith when it deals with the timeless and spaceless world, where the thought symbols that epitomize time and space experience are inapplicable, and where a certain vagueness of outline marks objects and events, probably because we have as yet no thought symbols for them except those derived from the still misty realm of our own consciousness. In mind functioning as faith, there occur, along with emotion, impulse, and desire, also cognitive elements, such as recognized traces of the divine movement in physical nature, or history or personal experience, traces as real as the footprints of long-vanished reptiles in the Connecticut Valley sandstone; and in the one case as in the other, with these materials of observation, the imagination sets about its proper work of reconstruction.

Besides, there are the observations and reconstructions which countless generations back of us have made and which are now deeply organized in our constitution and rise up, we hardly know whence, to face us as imperious religious instincts. On the other hand, there is an intuitive, or instinctive, element in reason. While, as Pascal says, we *infer* the truth of propositions, we *feel* the truth of first principles. And who would deny the instinct of causality, of the existence of the external world, of the uniformity of natural law, which are presuppositions of the rational process everywhere?

It appears, therefore, that the opposition between religious intuition, or faith, and reflective analysis, or reason, is, as Edward Caird says, not a real opposition; each complements the other in the development of the religious life. This conclusion will, perhaps, prepare us to enter more hopefully upon the consideration of the positive religious affinities and implications of science.

THE SPIRIT OF SCIENCE.

I ask you to think first of the mental attitude of the masters of science, the spirit in which they have undertaken and prosecuted their work.

The publication in 1637 of Descartes' "Discourse on Method" is sometimes fixed upon as the beginning of the modern scientific development. In that famous treatise one of the central principles is the consecration of doubt as a duty; and the tradition of doubt, or skepticism, has clung tenaciously to the scientific calling down to our own day. But it is grossly misinterpreted. The apotheosis of doubt is supposed to be the chief feature of the cult of science, which offers sacrifice on no other altar. The case is far otherwise. The high-priest who, perhaps more than any other, is responsible for this apotheosis, declares that he always had an intense desire to learn how to distinguish truth from falsehood, in order to be clear about his actions and to walk sure-footedly in this life. There is, he said, a path which leads to truth so surely that even the lowest capacity can find it; and this is his guiding rule by which a man may find and keep that path:

"Give unqualified assent to no propositions but those the truth of which is so clear that they cannot be doubted."^a

^aQuoted by Huxley, *Essays*, Descartes' "Discourse on Method."

Moreover among the laws which he established for his own self-government occurs this fourth one:

"Make the search for truth the business of life."

It is not doubt, but truth to which Descartes pays homage, and the same high allegiance has bound all the priestly line downwards. Copernicus doubts the Ptolemaic astronomy until he can verify or displace it. Vesalius cannot bow at once before the authority of Galen and the authority of Nature. Lamarck, poor, old, blind, doubts the world which contemns him, that he may hold fast the new truth of transformationism, which is his sufficient consolation. Johannes Müller is led by doubt of the current teaching to a fresh examination of the foundations of physiology and morphology, and he gathers so large a harvest of truth that these sciences in his hands enter upon a new phase of development. Lyell doubts, and builds the new geology. And so it has been with all those who have given a new pace or a new direction to our growing knowledge of nature. Doubt is the pathway, but truth is the goal.

Indeed, the leading characteristic of the scientific spirit is its whole-hearted consecration to truth, its openness of mind before every problem, its eagerness to press the solution to the last possible point of completeness, and the abiding peace with which it accepts the truth with all the consequences. And you observe that this distinctive attitude of the scientific mind clearly involves a moral quality and a capacity which is not unlike faith. I mean the capacity to see and bring near a lofty ideal and a nobleness of purpose in pursuit of it.

We are told that when Pasteur died a writer in one of the Paris newspapers "described the intimate routine of the life at the Pasteur Institute, and compared it with that of a mediæval religious community. A little body of men, forsaking the world and the things of the world, had gathered under the compulsion of a great idea. They had given up the rivalries and personal interests of ordinary men, and, sharing their goods and their work, they lived in austere devotion to science, finding no sacrifice of health or money, or of what men call pleasure, too great for the common object. Rumors of war and peace, echoes of the turmoil of politics and religion, passed unheeded over their monastic seclusion; but if there came news of a strange disease in

China or Peru, a scientific emissary was ready with his microscope and his tubes to serve as a missionary of the new knowledge and the new hope that Pasteur had brought to suffering humanity. The adventurous exploits and the patient vigils of this new Order have brought about a revolution in our knowledge of disease."^{*}

The brilliant research of the late Surgeon Walter Reid upon the etiology of yellow fever also illustrates the method and the spirit of science. He goes into the smitten region determined to find the cause of the dreadful malady. When wholly negative results follow the bacteriological investigation, men volunteer to sleep in rooms where the garments and bedding of patients dead of the disease are hung and shaken. No one of the volunteers succeeds in contracting it in this way, and then they try sleeping in the garments and beds of yellow fever patients. This also failing, Reid bethinks him of mosquitoes, which had been shown able to transmit malaria. The men cheerfully submit themselves to the tremendous risk for the sake of others, allow mosquitoes which had fed on the blood of patients to bite them, contract the disease, and demonstrate the agent of its spread.

These illustrations have already suggested that the scientific devotion to truth is animated not simply by the joy of the quest, but also by the hope of some sort of ministry to human need. Physiology, the mother of sciences, developed early because the stimulus of such a ministry was always present and urgent. But even in the case where no issue of practical service is foreseen, the investigator is sustained by the conviction that truth is the most precious of all possessions for the shackles it will break and the light it will throw on the dark path of life. What is it that the aged Professor Huxley says? "If I am to be remembered at all, I should like to be remembered as one who did his best to help the people." In the great hall of the Sorbonne, on his admission to a seat in the French Academy, Berthelot, who revolutionized organic chemistry, said:

"A savant worthy of the name consecrates a disinterested life to the grand work of our epoch: I mean the amelioration of the lot of all from the rich and happy to the humble, the poor, and

^{*}Metchnikoff, *The Nature of Man*. p. iii.

the suffering. . . . I have tried to make this the object and end, the directing purpose of my existence."

Look on this picture of Louis Pasteur. He is leaning over the head of an enormous bull-dog whose eyes are blood-shot and whose body is convulsed with spasms. He is sucking up into a tube some drops of saliva at the distance of a finger's length from the foaming head. No saint's self-effacement under a lofty impulse surpasses that which this laboratory scene exhibits. No Brother Bernard's ardor of aspiration which kept his face upturned towards heaven for the space of fifteen years, can be either intenser or nobler than this scientist's zeal and consecration to truth and humanity. While he was engrossed with the study of Splenic Fever and the experiments multiplied, Pasteur came to have what his daughter called the face of an approaching discovery. If anyone timidly asked him what stage the investigation had reached, he would reply, "I can tell you nothing. I dare not express aloud what I hope." At last one day he came up from his laboratory with the face of triumph. Tears of joy were in his eyes. As he embraced the members of the family, he said, "I should never console myself, if such a discovery as my assistants and I have just made were not a French discovery."

THE FAITH OF SCIENCE.

The scheme of physical nature is now conceived to be something like this: Gross matter consists of groups of atoms. Atoms consist of groups of electrical monads. Electrical monads, or ions, are only knots in the ether. Electricity itself, the reality of which matter is the sensible expression, is a modification of the ether, the stuff out of which the universe is wholly made. Now, the intellectual satisfaction which such a simple and consistent view of things imparts is intense, almost æsthetic, as Mr. Balfour has remarked. Why is it so? Why should we be more pleased to think of the sum of things as one substance taking varied manifestations, than to think of it as composed of the seventy-odd elementary substances which are inherently different from one another? There is no answer but that we have our scientific prejudices, one of which is the prejudice in favor of simplicity of conception. Strange to say, this prejudice remains unshaken in

the presence of evidence going to show the opposite character of the universe. We insist that the universe is simple and regular, in spite of apparent complexity and confusion. We are not content to observe and set down faithfully what nature actually presents to our senses; but we must needs work it over and bring it, with some violence it may be, into harmony with this deep-seated, ineradicable sentiment.

What we have here is obviously a sort of instinct about the nature of reality. However obscure may be its origin, its intimations are definite and clear. It anticipates and interprets sense experience. It holds the torch for science to work by. In the language of philosophy it would be called the necessary postulate of science. I prefer to call it the faith of science. Science cannot explain its faith in the unity and regularity of nature, neither can it get on without it.

It will be useful to set the faith of science side by side with the faith of religion. This has been done, with a clearness and force which I cannot undertake to improve, by the late Professor Joseph Le Conte:

"The necessary postulate of science, without which scientific activity would be impossible, is the rational order of the universe; and similarly the necessary postulate of religion, without which religious activity would be impossible, is the moral order of the universe. As science postulates the final triumph of reason, so religion must postulate the final triumph of righteousness. Science believes in the rational order, or in law, in spite of apparent confusion. . . . So also religion is right in her unmistakable belief in the moral order, in spite of apparent disorder and evil. . . . We may, if we like—as many do—reject the faith in the Infinite Goodness, and thereby paralyze our religious activity; but, then, to be consistent, we must also reject the faith in the Infinite Reason, and thereby paralyze our scientific activity."*

I may add that the faith of science is not without justification. Schiller says somewhere that nature stands in an eternal alliance with genius, and always honors its demands. For example, it is, according to Helmholtz, in the highest degree remarkable to see

*Essay in Royce's *The Conception of God*.

how large a number of comprehensive theorems, the proof of which taxes the highest powers of mathematical analysis, were found by Faraday without the use of a single mathematical formula, by a kind of intuition with instinctive certainty. And so, to the universal intuition of rationality and order, Nature responds with widening revelations of the supremacy of law. The progress of discovery is the practical justification of the scientific faith under which the progress was made. And we have noticed on a former occasion that when religious faith makes its venture upon the assumption of righteousness at the heart of things, it is not disappointed. The universe cashes its cheques in the currency of inward peace and a heightened efficiency for achievement in the outer life. The stars in their courses fight on its side for the supremacy of righteousness.

THE BEARING OF SCIENCE.

In the "Modern Painters" occurs a chapter "Of the Novelty of Landscape." A man acquainted with Greek, Roman, and Mediæval art is supposed to enter a room in which he sees for the first time a display of modern paintings. His first impression would be that there is something strange about the mind of these modern people. Mountains, lakes, trees, and bits of stone, clouds and runlets of water,—nobody ever seemed to be interested in these things before. The human interest, which wholly occupied the earlier painters, seems to have disappeared altogether. Not a picture of the gods or heroes, of saints or angels or demons, of councils or battles; but mountain peaks and ravines, forests and stretches of blue sky, stone walls, withered sticks and flying frogs! Whether this extraordinary change of art subjects is one to excite our pride or not, it is, as Ruskin says, assuredly one to excite our deepest interest. It is one of the expressions of the new sympathy with the phases of external nature which is one of the picturesque features of our period. This feeling occurs, indeed, in individual cases from early times in literary history, as in Horace and Lucretius and Theocritus, and in some of the early English poets; but today it is well-nigh universal, as is shown by the volume and popularity of out-door literature with its invitation—

Come forth into the light of things,
Let Nature be your teacher.

This later phase of it may be traced back to the eighteenth century. There were in the realm of letters Rousseau and Cowper and Wordsworth, who were industrious propagators of the sentiment. There was the genial naturalist of Selborne who taught Englishmen the inherent interest of common natural phenomena. Another representative of science was the Swiss geologist DeSaussure, who more than any other dissipated the ideas of horror and danger associated with mountains, and taught the world the infinite charm and variety of mountain scenery. In the latter half of the nineteenth century this sympathetic response to all nature's varying moods grew rapidly under the stimulus of the general scientific movement of the time and the influence of men like E. Krause in Germany, Richard Jefferies and Ruskin in England, and on this side, "Old Silver-Top," as John Burroughs has been affectionately called, and his younger followers, as Roberts, W. J. Long, and Thompson-Seton.

Nature was once devoid of interest when she was not repulsive—is now invested with attractions which are on every poet's tongue. We have acquired an eye for all her beauty, an ear for all her music, a heart open to all the suggestions of her solemn grandeur, her deep repose, her infinite order. She refreshes us in the inward part, she rebukes our strife and pettiness, she elicits and confirms our aspirations. We no longer have to make our way through an enemy's country at the risk of losing our religion at every step. The later and deeper scientific interpretation of nature makes her our ally and friend. One is not surprised, therefore, to hear Professor Shaler saying that it was a more profound grasp of science itself that brought him back from an early excursion into religious negations.* For science has now laid bare the solid foundations on which religion reposes. Let us take note of some particulars.

1. *The Unity of Nature.*—I have a mathematical friend who says that mathematics, as well as the Bible, makes the proclamation, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God." He explains that the number of curves of the fourth power of the unknown quantity is countless, and those of the fifth power are even more numerous; and yet he shows me an expression con-

* *The Interpretation of Nature*, p. iv.

taining a very few letters that will apply to the length of every possible curve, another that will apply to the surface described by the revolution of every possible curve, and another to the solid described by the revolution of every possible curve. In short, for this infinite diversity, one comprehending principle.

We are able today to recognize relations where formerly only discrete facts were perceived. We discover interdependence and harmony where to the older conception there appeared only isolation, if not discord. For us the doctrine of the ether and the law of gravitation bind the myriad worlds of space into a consistent universe. The law of evolution unifies the totality of nature as it exists today by supplying the one method of its origin, as the protoplasm theory imparts structural unity to the varied forms of organic nature. The law of the correlation of energy obliterates the territorial boundaries which formerly divided off the phenomena of nature into distinct and unrelated regions. It might have been foreseen that, after the unity of external nature was discovered, the moral and spiritual sphere could not long withhold the secret of its inner consistency and relationships. Here also boundaries have taken themselves up and off, and the separate and warring provinces of the spirit have fused into one realm under one law. So that the natural and the supernatural no longer threaten and confound one another across an impassable chasm. There is no chasm. The supernatural is natural, and the natural is supernatural. Even that inveterate antithesis of matter and spirit shows signs of dissolving. In some of the seers of the race, as Plato and Dante, matter and spirit compound for their differences and almost melt into one another; in the impassioned glow of their conceptions, as Walter Pater points out, the spiritual attains visibility and the material drops its earthiness. But with a new stress and inflection we are now asking whether matter is not simply the signal of the spirit's activity, the theatre where the spirit disports itself, the word in which the spirit seeks expression, the garment of beauty in which the spirit arrays itself.

Moreover, the divine and the human nature draw into a close fellowship, the human nature being divine in its origin and aspiration, and the divine nature finding that it can express itself in the

human. The divine nature no longer sits apart in remote cold clouds concerning itself with man only to impose an arbitrary legislation from which it is itself exempt. On the contrary, with the new light on that ancient word, "Let us make man in our image," we now see that community of nature necessitates one law. There is not one righteousness below and another above the clouds. The coinage of the moral realm must pass current in heaven and on earth alike.

Lotze remarks that, "To us who admire the isolated remains, the thought expressed in many an ancient work of art seems to be too slight in comparison with the labor expended in presenting it in sculpture; but such works were then intended to serve as fitting adornments in edifices the most insignificant details of which were pervaded by a coherent idea of harmonious beauty of form." So, isolated and apparently insignificant details of nature acquire meaning and become worthy and noble in the light of their relation to the majestic structure of which they are constituent parts. But this consideration is not all. The unified system of things revealed by science is the necessary corollary of the religious faith in the infinite personal intelligence. If God exists, this is precisely such a world as he would make. There can hardly be any doubt that the growing conception of the unity of nature which has marked the last three or four decades had much to do with the unmistakable movement towards faith during the same period.

2. *The New Teleology*.—But one may say that nature may be a self-consistent unit, and yet be nothing more than a machine, and therefore morally indifferent; or, if it have moral significance, what assurance have we that it is good and not bad? Indeed, one meets such views now and again in contemporary literature. For example, in his well-known lecture on "Art and Morality," Ferdinand Brunetiere declares that nature's indifference to us is equalled only by her lack of regard for all that we call by the name of good or bad. He goes still farther and says that, "nature is immoral, thoroughly immoral;" that "there is no vice of which she does not give us an example, nor any virtue from which she does not dissuade us;" and in her failures, exceptions, and monstrosities he thinks he finds evidence that she is no more true than she is good.

There can be no surprise that laymen in science take such a view when it is remembered that scientists themselves have given the cue. So acute and influential a man as Professor Huxley was not a little perplexed by what he considered the conflict between the cosmic process and the ethical process which is observed in human history. In his famous Romanes Lecture on "Evolution and Ethics" in 1893, he said:

"The practice which is ethically best—what we call goodness or virtue—involves a course of conduct which, in all respects, is opposed to what leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In the place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint. . . . It repudiates the gladiatorial theory of existence."

He thinks, furthermore, that, since both have been evolved, there is as much natural sanction for the immoral sentiments as for the moral. Accordingly, it seems, on the face of things, that the ancient philosophy of pessimism gains in the evolution theory a new and broader basis; the doctrine that Satan is the Prince of this world gets a scientific foundation. The struggle for existence is as cruel as it is inevitable. The tyranny of strength and cunning is unmitigated. Teeth and claws go at their bloody business without mercy. And all life together is helpless under the mighty hand of fate which seems supreme in the physical world. Vain is the cry of the innumerable tender things which are crushed in the grind of the great machine.

But we need to take a second and deeper look at the ethical bearing of the evolution theory, to see whether this dark and bloody inference is justified. The trouble with the inference lies in the limited range of the induction, in the lack of perspective. Its observation is too exclusively microscopic. One day when this matter was in discussion Tennyson told the story of a tender-hearted Brahmin who, on observing with the microscope how the creatures in the world of a water-drop were devouring one another, was moved with a boundless indignation at an instrument which made such a revelation of heartless cruelty, and smashed it into fragments. What we require is, not to make this sort of observation impossible, but to supplement the microscope with the telescope, to lift our eyes from details to tendencies, from the

individual to the species. I think we shall see that "the gladiatorial theory of existence" is unwarranted.

Let me remind you that the terms in which it is expressed—self-assertion, struggle, the hunting down of competitors—are figures of speech in scientific literature; and when they are interpreted in strict literalness are wholly inapplicable. We are not justified in reading human standards and sentiments into the behavior of the lower animals. The butcher-bird which rends a titmouse limb from limb is no more cruel than the human butcher who quarters beef for the market; nay, than that same Texas steer was when his lithe tongue lapped in the helpless tender herbage of the prairie. If a man should rend a titmouse limb from limb, the action would be properly called cruel; but the butcher-bird is not a man, and its action is neither good nor bad, for it is not performed in the realm of moral ideas. It is true the bird is not merciful; neither is it moved by malice. Besides it is not improbable that the exposure of the titmouse tribe to such a peril reacts favorably upon the tribal constitution, improving in the long run its powers of flight and its wits. If so, whatever view the impaled individual titmouse may take, the butcher-bird is the friend of the species, a blessing in disguise. And it is to be remembered further that the birds of prey are not to be compared in the number either of species or of individuals with the vegetable feeders. There is, in fact, no adequate ground for the popular view which, under the theory of the struggle for existence, construes the world as an arena where all organisms, man included, fight one another to the death. When species are exterminated at all, it is not in a wholesale slaughter, but by the gradual and usually painless operation of forces extending over a succession of generations, such as the failure of correspondence with the total environment, which may or may not include animals of prey. A most effective factor and one which involves no suffering is the progressive diminution of the degree of fertility necessary to the maintenance of the species. Another is the weakness or rigidity of organization which retards unduly its adaptation to a changing environment.

With this explanation of terms, we may advance to consider the general trend of things under the evolution process. Now it is involved in the nature of the process that "the first in concep-

tion is the last in execution;" a tendency is to be judged by its issue. The last term of an evolutionary series may prophesy what is yet to follow, but it can hardly be doubted that it also interprets what has gone before it. The nature of man is the crown of the process of evolution. We need not inquire now whether a still higher creature is possible to it. We only need to recognize man as the latest and highest term in a long series which stretches back to the dawn of organic life on earth. His physical frame is the most complex in structure and the most efficient in action in the whole series. His mental life is the widest, the fullest, and the most varied. His moral nature is so much advanced beyond what appears in any of the creatures below him that some deny its hereditary connection with any possible germs of morality anywhere else in the series. This highly endowed creature whose most distinctive feature is his capacity to discern the good and the bad, standing thus as the climax of the natural achievement, throws backward over all the lower grades of organization a light in which the meaning and purpose of all grows plain. In this light nature is seen to be on the move. Things are marching out of a dim past into a widening future. The struggle for existence is transformed into "a race for perfection." The cosmic process is itself driving forward to an ethical issue, and that once reached the development is continued into religion and social regulations. And how can the cosmic process be in conflict with the ethical process which, even according to Professor Huxley, was produced by it? Will the mother repudiate her offspring?

In this general purposive progress from the inorganic to the organic, from sensation to mind, from mind to morals and religion,—from the clod to conscience,—we have ample compensation for the surrender, upon the demand of science, of Paley's minute design, the teleology of details. Shall I appeal to the authority of Darwin? He cannot, indeed, allow that the variations of organic beings are designed, but he says, "If we consider the whole universe, the mind refuses to look at it as the outcome of chance, i. e., without design or purpose."^{*} And here is Huxley saying that "it is only the common and coarse forms of teleology

^{*}More Letters, I., 395.

that fail when tested by natural selection. There is a wider teleology which is not touched by the doctrine of evolution, but is actually based upon the fundamental proposition of evolution."

The end and explanation, the climax and denouement of the divine drama in creation, is the emergence from the bosom of universal nature of a spirit which can stand erect and speak face to face with God. And God is repaid for aeons of waiting and travail, for it breaks his infinite solitude, his uncompanioned journeyings through wildernesses of insensate things, and presents him with a person, in some way his counterpart, in possibility his friend. The rise through successive grades of being up to this fulfillment of the creative impulse is symbolized in epitome in Seraphita's farewell on the eve of her translation when she looks out over the mountain-girt fiord from the cliff of the Sieg:"

"Farewell, rock of granite, thou shalt be a flower; farewell flower, thou shalt be a dove; farewell dove, thou shalt be a woman; farewell woman, thou shalt be suffering; farewell man, thou shalt be belief; farewell, you, who shall be all love and prayer!"

3. *The Idealistic Interpretation of Nature.*—The illuminating and supporting influence of science upon religion is not restricted to the two generalizations which we have now considered. There is another of perhaps even richer significance to which, as I conclude these lectures, I must call your attention.

Within the last thirty or forty years there has been in progress a marked change of feeling on the part of leading men of science respecting the ultimate reality, the deeper meaning of the universe; so that today scientific opinion presents a radically different front on this paramount question. About the middle decades of the last century it seems to have been flushed with its recent conquests and to have been in high conceit with its well-nigh omnipotent method. It was already well advanced in its mission of plucking the heart of mystery out of universal nature, and but a few years more of the unflinching application of the laws of physics and chemistry would suffice to finish the business and set man free from the thralldom of the last superstition. It was dogmatic and arrogant. Latterly, however, scientists have recognized with increasing clearness that they have been occupied with

surface problems whose solution has merely led them into the central mysteries, and before these they stand in a helpless impotence which has completely changed their tone and attitude. The physical tests on which they have hitherto relied cannot be applied here, and the impression is produced that the essence of things, which refuses to respond to these tests, is after all not physical. Hæckel himself cites a number of cases of such changes of view, such psychological metamorphoses, as he calls them,—Virchow, Emil du Bois-Reymond, Wundt, Von Baer. He seeks to explain them as due to the increase of prejudice and the loss of energy attendant upon the decay of the brain as old age comes on. He must have forgotten this "explanation" when he came to write his preface, in which he says:

"For fully half a century has my mind's work proceeded, and I, now in my sixty-sixth year, may claim that it is mature."

In reality these changes spring out of the fuller recognition of the limitations of the scientific method, the ease with which the assurance of a predetermined negation may be broken down. With Browning's acute old Bishop, they say:

How can we guard our unbelief,
Make it bear fruit to us?—the problem here.
Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, someone's death,
A chorus-ending from Euripides,—
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears,
As old and new at once as Nature's self,
To rap and knock and enter in our soul,
Take hands and dance there a fantastic ring,
Round the ancient idol, on its base again—
The grand Perhaps. We look on helplessly;
There the old misgivings, crooked questions, are.

Science is much more modest than formerly in the presence of the universal religious instinct. Not only so. There are positive declarations on every hand that the conception of the physical world as a mechanism constructed on a rigid mathematical plan "has no more objective reality than the circles of latitude and longitude on the sun." Hear this word of Professor Karl Pearson: "Step by step men of science are coming to recognize that mechanism is not at the bottom of phenomena." And this from the President of the British Association last year: "As

natural science grows it leans more, not less, upon an idealistic interpretation of the universe." Indeed, all men, excepting of course always the eminent Zoölogist of Jena, all men are feeling now that a system of things out of which by natural processes mind arose must itself be mental. And there seems to be no longer any reason to question Sir Oliver Lodge's recent statement,—“the region of religion and the region of the completer science are one.”

I think of Science as passing to and fro in God's garden, busy-ing itself with its forms of beauty, its fruits and flowers, its creeping thing, its beast and bird, the crystal shut in its stones, the gold grains of its sands, and coming, now at length in the cool of the long day, upon God himself walking in his garden.

The Crusade Against the Railroads

By WILLIAM H. GLASSON,

Professor of Economics in Trinity College

The remarkable movement for rate reduction and restrictive railway legislation which has swept over the country during the past year—and especially during the past three months—is comparable only with the famous “granger” agitation of the seventies which for many years prevailed in the States of the Middle West. At that time popular feeling against real and supposed railroad abuses brought about laws and judicial decisions which reduced rates and subjected the railroads to many important restrictions. Professor Emory R. Johnson says of this “granger” movement in his “American Railway Transportation:” “The people of the West did not fully understand the railway problem; but they knew that the railroads were unjustly discriminating, and they were convinced that local rates were disproportionately high. They believed also that the railroad corporations were public carriers, performing a service of a public nature, the charges for which could be regulated by public authority. The companies, however, at first ignored the public, and then defied them. The public accepted the gage of battle, the railroad companies were defeated, and the so-called ‘granger laws’ and ‘granger decisions’ were the result.” The present agitation for fare reduction, freight rate regulation, and other forms of restriction and control, is far more widespread in its territorial extent and comprehensive in its scope than the earlier movement which has just been recalled.

In this article especial attention is called to the crusade for passenger fare reduction, just now in progress all over the country, and regarding which comparable facts from the various States are most readily obtained. In 1906 Ohio led off by reducing the maximum passenger rate on all her railroads from three to two cents a mile. The new rate has been in force somewhat more than nine months. Virginia, in the same year, passed an act which empowered and required the State Corporation Commission “to fix and prescribe a schedule of rates for the trans-

portation of passengers by all transportation companies." Until such a schedule should be fixed, the act required railroads to issue mileage books at the rate of two cents a mile. This act was declared by the Court of Appeals of Virginia to be unconstitutional. However, the State Corporation Commission of Virginia has for several months been hearing evidence in the matter of passenger fare reduction, citing all the railroads of the State to appear and show cause why a maximum rate of two cents a mile should not be made effective. The evidence is about complete, but it is not possible to predict the outcome of the hearing. Maryland also enacted in 1906 a law requiring the issue of mileage books at the two cent rate.

As to the passenger fare legislation of the present year, it is not yet possible to give more than a very incomplete statement. In many States fare reduction bills are yet pending before the legislature or awaiting the signature of the governor. However, the general trend of events throughout the country is clearly shown by the following facts with regard to the action taken in the various States as reported in the newspaper press:*

Alabama—Has adopted a two and a half cent passenger fare.

Arkansas—Has sent a two cent fare bill to the governor for his signature. Press reports state that the bill was passed without giving the railroads a chance to present their side of the case.

Arizona—A three cent fare bill was passed by the House but was killed in the Council. Four cent fare bills are now before both houses.

Georgia—The matter of passenger fare reduction is being agitated in the press. The State Railroad Commission has been asked to take action on the matter of ordering a two cent fare.

Illinois—The House has passed a two cent fare bill. The Senate has advanced upon its calendar a two cent fare bill, with a schedule allowing a higher rate to roads with small earnings.

Indiana—The Indiana legislature has passed a two cent fare bill. The powers of the State Railroad Commission have been greatly enlarged.

Iowa—The House passed a two cent fare bill by 106 to 0. After conference with the Senate, a bill was finally passed by both

*Reports are included up to about March 12, 1907.

houses which established a two cent fare for roads earning \$4,000 a year gross per mile. Roads with smaller earnings may charge two and one-half cents and three cents per mile. The governor has signed the bill.

Kansas—A two cent fare bill has passed the legislature.

Maine—An effort is being made in the legislature to compel two roads to adopt a two cent mileage. It is not likely to succeed.

Minnesota—The House has passed a two cent fare bill. It seems certain to pass the Senate.

Mississippi—The Railroad Commission has ordered a two cent fare for books on the interchangeable mileage basis. A two cent fare bill is also before the legislature.

Missouri—The legislature has passed the two cent fare bill.

Nebraska—The two cent fare bill passed unanimously in both House and Senate. It was signed by the governor and went into effect about March 5. The press reports state that the railroads have discontinued a number of trains, and that they have also agreed to withdraw all excursion, convention, ministerial, and similar reduced rates in the State. It is also said that the Union Pacific Railroad will stop work on a \$1,200,000 building which it was about to erect in Omaha. A later report announces that the railroads will contest the two cent fare law on the ground that it is confiscatory. An Omaha, Neb., dispatch of March 13, says: "The Union Pacific Railroad announced this morning that work on the Athol Hill Cut-off, near Cheyenne, Wyo., would be discontinued at once because of adverse legislation toward that road ending in a cut in rates. The Athol Hill is between Denver and Cheyenne and is the heaviest grade on the system. It was designed to construct fifteen miles of new road, cutting off the hill and grade. Eighty per cent. of grading has been finished."

Nevada—The governor has signed the bill creating a State Railroad Commission. The House has passed a five cent fare bill, about half the present rate in Nevada.

New Jersey—A two cent fare bill is pending. A drastic Railroad Commission bill is before the legislature.

New Mexico—The legislative House has passed a three cent fare bill, and the Council is expected to adopt it.

New York—Half a dozen two cent fare bills have been intro-

duced, but they have not received much attention. There are 110 railroad bills before the legislature.

North Carolina—Has enacted a two and a quarter cent fare law, exempting railroads sixty miles or under in length. This flat rate takes the place of a first-class rate of three and a quarter cents and a second-class rate of two and three-quarters cents. The railroads are required to sell interchangeable mileage tickets. There has also been a large reduction in freight rates within the State.

North Dakota—Both houses of the legislature have passed a two and a half cent fare bill. One thousand mile books are required to be sold at the rate of two cents a mile.

Oklahoma—It is proposed that the constitutional convention shall put a two cent fare provision in the constitution.

Oregon—A sweeping Railroad Commission law has just been passed by the legislature. It gives the commission power to regulate rates.

Pennsylvania—The House passed the two cent fare bill by a vote of 175 to 0. It went to the Senate. The railroads are making a strong protest against the bill. The following is a press report sent out from Harrisburg, Pa., under date of February 15: "Amid jeers and cries, and after the baiting by the whole House of the spokesman for the railroads, the House has unanimously passed the two cent a mile bill, to defeat which George F. Baer, President of the Reading Railroad, sent out a remarkable protest Monday. As he finished the whole legislature rose to its feet and cried: 'Who is Baer?' 'Are we for him? No!' The Speaker made absolutely no attempt to stop the disorder, and amid laughter and gibes the bill was passed. It now goes to the Senate which it will pass." If accurate, this report is certainly significant.

South Carolina—The House passed a two and a half cent fare bill by a large majority. The proposition was defeated in the Senate, a similar bill failing by 25 to 14.

South Dakota—The State Railroad Commission was authorized to make a passenger rate schedule not to exceed two and one-half cents a mile.

Tennessee—A legislative investigating committee is considering the subject of passenger rates, and it is rumored that it may re-

port in favor of a reduction from three to two and a half cents per mile.

Texas—There are 83 anti-railroad measures pending in the Texas legislature. Among them is a two cent fare bill.

West Virginia—A two cent fare bill has passed both houses of the legislature. Certain small roads are exempted.

Wisconsin—Bills to reduce passenger fares were introduced into the legislature. The legislature delayed action pending the decision of the State Railroad Commission, which had power to act in the matter. The State Railroad Commission ordered the fares reduced on certain of the principal railroads from three to two and a half cents. The railroads adopted a conciliatory attitude, as is shown by the following dispatch under date of March 11: "Without any curtailment of existing service, the principal railroads of Wisconsin last night put into effect the new passenger rates ordered by the State Railroad Commission twenty days ago. The roads have not only complied with the commission's order reducing the maximum rate from three to two and a half cents a mile, but also have followed its recommendation regarding the sale of 500-mile family mileage books for \$10. The new rates apply only to points within the State. Those to Chicago and other points remain the same as they have been. It is estimated that the reduction in rates will save the residents of the State about \$1,000,000 a year. The roads that were ordered by the State Commission to reduce their rates are the Chicago & Northwestern, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, and the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha. The Wisconsin Central voluntarily followed suit, fearing that competition would force it to do so anyhow."

The foregoing shows how widespread the crusade for fare reduction is; embracing especially the Middle Atlantic States, the Southern States, the North Central States, and the States of the Middle West and of the Northwest. We shall not be able to sum up its total results in legislation until the State legislatures have completed their work and the respective governors have had the opportunity to pass upon the measures which come to them for signature. Some conclusions we can draw at the present moment. It is obvious that rate reduction in any particular State cannot be solely or principally charged to local hostility or

personal spite. These influences may somewhat shape the form of the measures passed, but the agitation itself has been due to powerful influences felt all over the country. Again, it is clear that in many States the railroads are being dealt with in a spirit of anger, arbitrarily, with scant hearing or attention to the principles of justice. There seems to be considerable evidence, too, that they are being most harshly treated in those States where they have been least willing to concede the right of the State to care for the public interest by regulating the management of their business. A defiant attitude has bred bitter resentment, unreasoning hostility, and unjust restrictions. The claim that the railroad business is purely a private concern and not a proper subject for governmental control is today an untenable position. Those railroad managers who are recognizing this fact and endeavoring to bring about harmonious and coöperative relations between the public and the private owners are playing a wise and patriotic part. A contrary attitude is responsible for much of the present flood of restrictive measures. If one contrasts the recent experience of the railroads in Nebraska with that in Wisconsin, it would surely seem that much is to be gained from a conciliatory attitude towards the desires of the public.

The widespread reduction of fares now being made by State legislatures will doubtless in many cases do grave injustice. The fact that the Ohio legislature last year passed a two cent fare law, and that, in a time of exceptional prosperity, the railroads have been able to operate profitably under its provisions, is no good reason for the adoption of the same standard in other parts of the country under very different conditions. Many legislatures have stopped before going to that extreme. Yet we find a two cent rate applied to the railroads of rural Arkansas, the same that is permitted to the New York Central Railroad operating under conditions of dense passenger traffic and connecting New York with a number of other great cities. To illustrate what is meant, some statistics of passenger traffic for 1904 may be cited. In that year, the average number of passengers per mile of railroad in the whole country was 3,384. In the New England States it was 15,704; in the Middle Atlantic States, 10,651; in the South Atlantic States, 1,384; in the Gulf and Mississippi Valley States, 1,581; and in the Southwestern

States, 954. A two cent rate may be fair for the railroads of Massachusetts, New York, or Pennsylvania; but that rate, or one slightly higher, is not therefore just to the railroads of Arkansas, North Carolina, or Georgia. It is surely a case of "Heads I win and tails you lose" for the public of the less densely populated States to demand continually of the railroads better and more expensive passenger service and at the same time to enforce rates which are likely to greatly decrease passenger earnings.

Further wrong is often done in applying the same low rate to roads of far different earning power within a State. The pioneer road which is doing a service in hastening the development of an industrially backward part of a State cannot justly be required to furnish transportation at the same price as that charged by long established and prosperous lines connecting the chief centers of population and business. To enforce uniformity under such circumstances is the height of economic un wisdom. It is not only a wrong to the private persons who have invested their capital in a comparatively doubtful enterprise, but it is also in the long run a serious wrong to the public by discouraging further investments in developmental work and stifling that spirit of individual initiative which has been so great a force in American industrial progress.

The legislatures of the States have, within certain constitutional limitations, the legal right to fix rates and fares. But it is extremely doubtful whether in actual practice they are bodies so organized and so constituted as to be able to exercise this important power wisely and equitably. From legislature to legislature there is frequently an almost entire change of personnel. There are often few members with much previous experience in legislative work. The legislators commonly are not well qualified to pass upon so complicated and difficult a matter as the determination of the actual schedule of rates which will work justice as between the private owners of railroad capital and the whole people of a State. Where they act upon the matter, they must follow the recommendation of a committee. Such a committee may be composed of able men, but, under the pressure of the many measures to be disposed of during a session limited in length, they can rarely give adequate consideration to rate making, even though their fairness and industry be above reproach. A legisla-

ture may adopt the alternative method of delegating its rate making power to a railroad commission, and this would seem to be the better plan. Congress has so delegated certain rate making power over interstate commerce to the Interstate Commerce Commission. This commission contains men of a high order of ability and of expert knowledge. It is able to give extended hearing and careful consideration in all matters before it. Such a plan of exercising control over rates within a State is much more apt to do justice to all parties concerned than direct legislative action. The standard of ability and integrity of the members of such a commission should be equal to that usually maintained in our highest courts. It is right that railroad charges should be controlled in the interest of the public, but a matter of such economic importance should not be decided in an arbitrary or prejudiced manner. In this connection, the Wisconsin law deserves attention.

The financial effect upon the railroads of the general movement for fare reduction will vary with the road or the section of the country concerned. Many roads will continue to operate under the reduced rates without serious reduction of their net earnings. This is especially true on lines where the traffic is comparatively dense. In such cases a moderate reduction may prove entirely proper. Many railroads have shared largely in the prosperity of the last few years. Some have largely increased their dividends. Then again passenger earnings are a minor part of the receipts of railroads as compared with freight earnings, and such railroads as can maintain their freight rates may suffer little or no decrease in their total earnings. An abolition of passes and various kinds of reduced rate favors may effect a considerable saving, without the necessity of lessening the efficiency of the service. There is also the possibility that reduced fares may stimulate traffic and give some roads an addition to their earnings by increasing the average number of passengers carried in their trains.

In other cases, where legislatures have greatly reduced both passenger and freight rates, the roads may feel that the action taken is so harsh and oppressive that they are compelled to appeal to the courts for relief on the ground that the legislatures have violated constitutional restrictions and have virtually confiscated private property. Where it is not thought that the reduction is so great as to be confiscatory according to the stand-

ards of the courts, roads may still consider it an unwarranted hardship and attempt to enter upon retaliatory measures. While conforming to the legislative rate, they may discontinue some of their trains and furnish inferior service. If they do this, they will have to reckon with the fact that the furnishing of poorer service will doubtless kindle resentment—perhaps unreasonable—but none the less dangerous and costly in the long run. They may also discontinue the sale of all excursion, convention, ministerial, and other reduced rate tickets. If adopted, this policy might in some cases effect a saving. But in other cases it might result in the loss of most of the traffic that is now carried at the reduced rates. It would be the reverse of an economical policy for a railroad to haul trains not well filled, when it might otherwise haul full trains, containing, in part, reduced rate passengers who would not travel at the regular rate. Some roads may find it possible to make advances in freight rates within a State, or in interstate freight rates, sufficient to reimburse them for passenger fare reduction. This would probably arouse less general resentment than furnishing inferior passenger service.

Wherever the legislative restrictions are not absolutely oppressive, it would seem to be the policy of wisdom for the railroads to adopt conciliatory methods, to comply with the law in good faith, to give as good service as possible, and to avoid any unnecessary show of defiance or retaliation. It is encouraging to note that many of the men highest in authority in railroad circles are coming to recognize the necessity of abandoning a policy of silence and aloofness and of cultivating harmonious understanding and relations between the roads and the public. One who has read the newspaper press during the past month might cite a number of striking utterances recently made by railroad presidents, directors, and financiers, in conformity with this view of the situation. The railroads have much to gain from such a scrupulous regard to the discharge of their public obligations as will entitle them to the fullest and fairest consideration of their interests in the forum of public opinion.

It should certainly be pointed out that while the prevailing prosperity of the country has been generally reflected in increased earnings, there are other aspects of the situation not so favorable

to the railroads. The increased cost of living has of late made it necessary for the railroads generally to make heavy increases in their outlay for wages of employees. The cost of all kinds of material and supplies has advanced. The tremendous growth of traffic has made imperative large expenditures in the improvement of roadbed, equipment, and terminal facilities. Some systems have almost broken down under the great traffic pouring in upon them, and have virtually to be reconstructed. Thus the railroads are today coming into the money market as prospective borrowers of hundreds of millions of dollars. Legislation reducing their earning power must necessarily lessen their credit, and unfavorably affect the terms upon which loans are secured, or prevent their obtaining loans at all. Public hostility to the railroads has had exactly this effect during the last few months. Several railroads have had to pay unusually high rates for temporary loans. The value of railroad securities has shown a marked decline, and just recently conditions of panic for a time prevailed. All over the country the people and their legislative representatives are requiring of the railroads better and more expensive service, and, at the same time, are reducing the earnings which make such improvement possible.

The passenger fare reduction movement to which this article has been especially devoted is but one phase of a widespread agitation for all sorts of restrictive railway legislation. The States are enacting laws creating railroad commissions, reducing freight and passenger rates, prohibiting discriminations and rebates, establishing penalties for delay in the transportation of goods, enforcing liability for damages to passengers, prohibiting free passes, reducing the hours of labor of railroad employees, requiring the introduction of safety appliances, prohibiting combinations and traffic agreements, and dealing with a host of other questions arising in the course of the transportation business. No wonder that this onslaught of legislative restrictions has caused managers to abandon their accustomed reserve. No wonder that some of them are suggesting the possibility of substituting federal for State supervision and looking to the President of the United States for the suggestion of a program of settlement and relief. As it is, the vitally important business

which they are conducting is the object of widespread suspicion, and of hostile and vindictive action.

One would be a blind apologist for the railroads not to perceive that for this general hostility they are themselves largely responsible. They have been exposed frequently as disobedient to the laws of the land in the matter of rebates and discriminations, and many convictions are now on record in the courts against them. Attention has been centered upon their delinquencies by an executive who proposes to enforce the laws as they are on the statute books. In the matter of the efficiency of their service they have opened themselves to severe attack. The transportation companies failed to move needed winter supplies of fuel and food promptly in the Northwest. In the South the management of both freight and passenger traffic has at times seemed utterly demoralized. Worse than this, in recent months, on what are supposed to be the best railroads of the country, there has been an appalling series of passenger train wrecks with hundreds of persons maimed and killed. During the Christmas holidays the Baltimore & Ohio killed fifty-nine persons in a single wreck in the suburbs of the national capital. The Southern Railroad killed its own President. The Pennsylvania Railroad killed over fifty near Atlantic City. The New York Central has recently killed a score or more in the suburbs of New York. Other parts of the country have contributed to the fatal roll. The virtues of private management do not shine in this record. While the roads have been managed on the public service side thus faultily, the nation has had exposed to it by the Interstate Commerce Commission some devious ways of railroad finance by which one road has been used as a great speculating machine, and many millions of profits have been made by the parties to an adroit "re-adjustment" of the securities of another. Such causes in the mass have had a cumulative effect upon public opinion. Add to them local grievances and hostility; add also the ambition of local politicians to capture for their personal advancement the liveliest issue in sight upon which to be swept into power, and you have at hand the principal elements necessary to explain what has taken place during the past few months.

How is the situation to be improved? Some railroad presidents are now seeking to escape from the embarrassing tangle of

State restrictions by proposing the widest extension of federal control and supervision, to cover commerce both within the States and between the States. While more uniform control of the railroads is certainly desirable, it seems that the national constitution opposes insuperable obstacles to the federal regulation of commerce carried on entirely within the borders of a single State. It is, however, hoped that much can be done along lines already suggested in this paper to bring about better conditions. The railroads should fully recognize the right of the public to regulate and control them. They should obey the laws in good faith and should strive to perform efficiently every service for which they are responsible. On the other hand the public should recognize the right of capital invested in the roads to receive a fair return and should protect its owners from unjust attacks upon their property. Nor should the management of that property be subjected to unreasonable restrictions. Such public control as is exercised should be put in competent and judicious hands and not exercised arbitrarily or ignorantly. And of the prosperity and welfare which the railroads play so important a part in producing, they should be permitted to enjoy not a meager, but a generous, share.

The Need of a Southern Program on the Negro Problem

BY REV. JOHN E. WHITE,

Pastor of Second Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga

A year ago it was my privilege to give utterance in *THE SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* to a conviction about some things which are false in Southern life. For the views then expressed wide publication was secured and they seemed from editorial and other opinion to strike out a response from many thoughtful minds of the South. It was urged that certain manifest discouragements to the South's influence and achievement had true explanation in the absorption of our thought by one single issue—the Negro.

Since that date on September 22 in the city of Atlanta I saw a great light. I now wish to go further and say that not only is that former conviction confirmed, but that, unless the white men of the South seek and find some stay to the drift of things, and obtain some common ground of agreement that will reduce the situation to simpler and safer terms, and direct agitation toward something tangible about the race issue, we are fated to conditions worse than discouraging; conditions,—in the light of what the Atlanta riot revealed,—which will jeopardize every interest of the Southern people. It is evident that the scattered protest against discussion has not been and never will be effective. The talk increases and will increase, the agitation gets sharper and the lines are drawn tenser every day. As we now stand in relation to the Negro there is no power on earth that can prevent the intensification of antagonism between the races. Those who are accidentally removed from contact with the real situation or who live upon the Northern borders where there is no mass of Negro population and who think the races are getting on nicely and that time will settle everything aright, are simply ignorant of the facts. Their counsel of "Peace! peace!" has no value. More intelligent, but almost as useless, is a very large number of the best Southern men who shake their heads gloomily and prefer not to prophesy at all, declaring that they see no way to avoid an inevitable fate.

A few months ago one of the editors of a great American magazine came South and to Atlanta to study the race problem. I took him one night to a prayer meeting of Christian citizens who were meeting every week to pray over the situation. As we came away I asked the gentleman what were his impressions of our meeting. This was his reply: "Well, I have been in the South some time now and my present impression is that, if God does not help you out some way, you are in a bad fix."

But leaders of the prayer meeting movement, as the necessity and wisdom of an extreme hour, have consistently come to the conviction of the little girl who complained about her brother's wickedness in catching and killing the little birds in his trap. One day she came in beaming with satisfaction, saying that she didn't reckon the Lord would let him catch any more birds. "What did you do to find that out?" she was asked. "Well, I first prayed that God wouldn't let the little birds go in the trap and then I went and kicked the old trap all to pieces."

The question is reasonably proposed to our best conscience and intelligence whether the Southern people have yet made a genuine effort to reduce the race issue to its simplest proportions? Have we had the best thought we are capable of concentrated in trying to deal with our problem creditably and constructively? Have we exhausted the resources of our statesmanship? Are we prepared to confess that the Southern white people are at the end of their row in the present state of things?

There are four propositions here submitted to consideration. They seem almost axiomatic to those who are in touch with the middle and lower sections of the South. They have been recently submitted to eighty college presidents and the replies so far received indicate a perfect unanimity among Southerners of light and leading.

First. The Southern white people are capable of a better agreement among themselves in the face of their situation than now exists.

Second. The front of the South toward the Negro and the race problem should be braver, more confident and more definite.

Third. So we should be freer to shift the emphasis of our anxiety from the Negro to the white man, the white boy, the white girl,

and the stress of agitation to Anglo-Saxon obligation and opportunity in the South.

Fourth. Therefore, there is needed a movement to bring about the ascertainment of facts and on the facts the pronouncement of a Southern program, defining relations and submitting a line of policy to which the Southern white people may address themselves, of which they will not be ashamed before the world, and in which the Negroes are guaranteed protection and a true progress.

We are not in agreement among ourselves. No *modus vivendi* has ever been undertaken. Although plainly involved in common conditions, by our history committed to a common point of view, by our sufferings consecrated to a common sympathy, inured to partisan political solidity and by homogeneous racial distinctness preserved in an unmixed Anglo-Saxonism, the white people of the Southern States are in front of what we jealously insist is our peculiar problem, without a general movement to suggest that we regard ourselves as entrusted with its task. Our thought is in such eddying confusion that many people among us deprecate all discussion of the race problem because it increases the confusion.

The least responsible elements of our population lacking the restraint and guidance of the more responsible elements to which they have the right to look for statesmanship, think blindly, feel blindly and now and again act blindly. The state of anti-negro sentiment, which we know exists in the lower sections of Southern society, is in a great degree due to a hopelessness and inaction they see in the ranks above them. If there was agreement and harmony of resolution the tendency would be to gather those classes into the ranks of orderly citizenship.

There are some who unhesitatingly avow that they do not believe the white people of the South are capable of coming into understanding among themselves. In a letter to me one of them declares that he doesn't believe the governors of the Southern States could be relied upon to agree among themselves concerning the way the South ought to do about this or even a simpler question which he names. I have more faith in the white people of the South than to believe it. If we are not able to realize the South's common interest, and to get our best minds and hearts in sufficient harmony to make the beginning of a movement

toward construction, we are then surrendered to an inevitable distraction and to the increasing disintegration of Anglo-Saxon masterhood in the South.

Aside from the Southern white man's self-respect and his duty to himself, there are two other strong reasons for an effort on our part to get together for something.

Our confusion of opinion provokes and promotes a greater confusion among the Negroes. The leaders of the Negro people are put to a trying task. Is it strange if they seem so much to work at cross purposes? We do not help them to adjust their people to their environment. How can we do so if we have not even attempted to define for ourselves what their environment and the conditions of their progress should be? One of the able Negro leaders has written to me, "Nothing is so much needed now as for the Negroes to know exactly what the Southern white people require at their hands."

There is a debt which the strong owe to the weak. It will be in part paid when the Anglo-Saxon of the South gets his own thought clear and into clear utterance about the relations which should exist between the white people and the Negro people of a common soil and whose welfare in the last analysis is a common weal.

Again, the necessity for agreement among the white men of our section and prompt attention to these matters on the part of the whole South is pressed upon us by the actual peril of sudden outbreak and violence at points where there is most misunderstanding and distrust between the races. It must be impressive to all prudent minds that outbreaks like the Atlanta and Mississippi riots tend to unsettle our own confidence of ability to control our situation and still more the confidence of other parts of the country. Suppose,—but, do you say, we should not suppose such things,—well, Senator Tillman says we may not only suppose, but expect what I am about to say,—suppose such outbreaks should continue? Will it be long before protests will be heard from Christian communities in other parts of the world as they are being heard now in the case of the Russian massacres and the atrocities in the Congo? And they will not be directed to the South, but towards the United States as a responsible nation, protesting against American inhumanities. One of the leading

public men in Alabama said to me three weeks ago that he would not be surprised to read in his paper any morning that the Tuskegee School and its eighty-seven buildings had gone up in the smoke of incendiarism. But for a prompt Gatling gun and a troop of forty soldiers the largest Negro institution in Atlanta, in which were crowded more than two hundred old negroes, women and children, would have been burned to the ground last September. What would be the result of such things happening in the South? There would be two results. Our race question would be no longer ours, but the nation's. The national honor would be involved. The negro issue here and elsewhere would become the subject of Congressional inquiry and investigation. That were bad enough, but the effect on our people would be infinitely worse. We would be plunged into a period of resentment and reaction on one side, of which political ambition would take advantage, and on the other those who are out of conscientious support of law and civilization would be forced into a position outside the sympathy of the masses of the people, creating a line of hot strife throughout the whole Southern society, the effect of which would be incalculably deplorable.

I wish I could convey to you the depth of feeling in the voice of a Southern man with business connections in New York as he said to me recently: "When Henry Grady went North and pleaded in behalf of patience and confidence in the South, we Southerners took courage and went among the business men of the North and carried Henry Grady's plea to them with great effect. We said, 'Let the South alone. She is going to work this matter out.' And now for seventeen years that has been the dominant feeling here. But," he said, "of late I detect in some of our best friends there the signs of uneasiness. They say, 'Yes, it is right that the Southern people should be left unharassed to work out their problem, but it would mightily strengthen our hope if we could see the beginning of some real movement to that end.'"

It is now being published to the world that the Southern States are the world's richest industrial opportunity. Our increase in wealth is stated in terms almost fabulous. It is asserted that we are getting rich at the rate of fifty-one millions a week and Great Britain only seven millions a week. Moreover we are assured

that our resources of wealth are scarcely touched as yet. Now these facts—and no one is in a position to dispute them—impose a great thoughtfulness on those who are thinking of men more than they are of money. They give rise to the question, whether the native Southerner is prepared to reap this harvest and to shape and control the civilization which will be based on it? Ireland is not so poor a land as its native sons are a powerless people.

Two years ago, as we came across the ocean together, a commissioner of the Manchester Cotton Mills told me that his errand was to the Southern States to ascertain the conditions on which English capital might purchase and control Southern cotton lands. During the two years I have watched that movement of alien landlordism fix its grip in a half dozen sections of the South. Wherever it occurs the Southern white boy, as his parents prosper in the purchase money, is losing his heritage, the birthright of a possible Southern man's civilization. Let this be, if you choose, a slight thing in itself, it propounds its question nevertheless. Are the Southern people in a position to reap their harvest or shall it go to a better prepared and more determined citizenship from elsewhere?

The answer to this serious question is going to hinge largely upon the development of a masterful *esprit de corps* in the Southern States, and I believe also that its answer is logically related to the attitude we permanently assume toward the Negro. I am speaking in view of all that has harassed and inflamed the South.

The Reconstruction era did the South one wrong—a wrong that went deep and far in determining the mood of our dealing with the Negro as a race, immediately following it and since. It shocked our sense of security. So desperate was the determination when the Federal drum beat was rattling close to our ballot boxes, to restore our civilization to Anglo-Saxon hands, that it left us a dread, almost a fear. That fear hurt our courage in this, that we took counsel of it, rather than the counsel of our force, in our attitude toward the Negro race. The black bulk made a shadow on every hustings and in the halls of legislation. That fear has tinged our policies. The harm of it was that it injures any man to be afraid and blunts his sense of moral right and duty. In most of our restrictive legislation since 1870,

our sense of superiority, our consciousness of Caucasian masterhood, the mood and attitude of the old South which made slavery almost a philanthropy, has not been, as it were better for all now it had been, the motive of our statecraft. Is it improbable that much of that which we think offensive in the Negro toward the white man and also much of that which in the white man is offensive to the Negro has come out of this fact? The Negro was not so dull as to fail to see that the white people had some kind of fear of him and without design or desire on his part the idea that he must have some sort of power, since the white people were afraid of him, took root in his subconsciousness. The manifestation of this greatly irritated the white people. On the other hand the fear of Negro domination encouraged by political campaigns colored our Anglo-Saxon force with a severity that promoted in the Negroes antipathies to which they were strangers before the war, when the white people dealt with them as strongly, but in such a mood as to generate love and trust instead of hate. If the restrictive measures of the South have in this sense failed to improve the situation, it is not because they were restrictive, but because they were conceived in the idea of self-defense.

We have always declared that we were the superior race, so much superior and so much stronger numerically and individually that any comparison was odious. It was the truth and it has always been the truth. But if an impartial investigating sociologist should visit the South and go fairly through everything that has happened from the hustings to the capitals, from the Magistrates' Courts to the Supreme Courts, would he not find the suggestion that, though eminently superior in all respects to the Negroes, we did not always seem to feel quite sure of it?

I began by saying that the leaving of this fear in the South was the great wrong done us by Reconstruction and its attendant measures. That wrong was one which we can never cease to regret, and the keener the moral sense of the South grows, the more we will regret it for the false Anglo-Saxonism it foisted into our civilization. But where is our logic and our consistency if, regarding the attitude of the defensive as one we ought not to have been forced into, we shall cling to it in a time when no necessity exists for it? For our power and supremacy are not in doubt today. The true demonstration of our supremacy awaits

the reversal of motive in our statesmanship. I believe that restrictive dealing for the Negro is wise dealing, not because I dislike or fear him, but because he needs its discipline. Limitation and denial of privilege is no barrier to true progress. The middle class Englishman is the world's illustration of progress developed within definite and agreed to limitations. We run our homes on that principle. I am strong, my child is weak; therefore I limit his rights and privileges. I owe that debt to the child's weakness. It is my duty to discharge it firmly and faithfully despite his misguided objections.

For us to come to the calm and steadfast resolve that the Negro is a child race and shape our front of civic and social policy toward him by that resolution is the imperative summons of this hour to the South, I am solemnly convinced. This would be masterful. The whole world will honor, applaud, and support the Southern people when they begin on a high strong program like that. I believe it will win and hold the coöperation of the wise and unselfish among Negro leaders.

It remains to be said that until the white people assume their true relation to the Negroes and reach a condition of resolution and understanding as to that, we may not expect them ever to be free from reactionary agitations sufficiently to realize their own necessities.

"Negro domination" is a millstone about the neck of the South. We are dominated by the Negro in our thoughts and in our feelings, of a truth, more dreadfully than we ever were in our state governments during Reconstruction. If we can get free here, we shall be free indeed. This is the South's way out. We must shift the emphasis of our concern to ourselves. Hon. Charles B. Aycock in North Carolina sounded a true slogan when he cried: "My campaign is not 'Nigger! Nigger!' but 'White man! White man!'" Where is the man who will come out in the open and espouse the proposition that 25,000,000 white men of the South are afraid of the 8,000,000 Negroes? What is their power to harm us? Do we fear that the African blood will be mixed with ours? If we do, let us put the point of our wrath against the white traitor to his race. If the South suffers any serious hurt from the Negroes, it will come at the white man's hands. The greater peril at this hour where outbreak and lawlessness are at

the surface is not that the Negro will lose his skin, but that the Anglo-Saxon will lose his soul. I am not discounting the duty we owe the Negro people, but I am declaring that the way to the discharge of that obligation is through the realization of the duty we owe ourselves. In every way the interests of the Negro in the South depend upon the prosperity and progress of the white people. Wherever the main line of Anglo-Saxon civilization stands still, there is the barrier to all expectation for the Negro. The only hope of the black man in this country is that the white man will move onward and upward. If he will not see it, let us see it. The statistics of white illiteracy are our concern far more than the statistics of Negro education. How weak in us to fume about Negro colleges, how strong it is to be disturbed about the lack of our own! The time is on us in the South to shift the accent of our great concern to the white man, the white boy, the white girl, that the man may be what he ought to be, that the boy may be prepared to reap the harvest of Southern wealth and power, and that the girl may be fitted for the motherhood of a gracious civilization.

To keep the Negro down is one thing, but to keep the white man up a nobler thing. To keep the Negro in his place is the ideal of those who build civilization on the sand, to keep the white man in his place, secure and strong, is the ideal of those who build it on the rock. Nor can that be done by fiat and decree. Favoring enactments of law, artificial props of statute declaration may serve for an hour, but the century will repeal them or annul them by the force of a higher law which declares that "Strait is the way and narrow is the gate that leads to life and few there be that go in thereat."

There is a fatuous idea that the reliance of Anglo-Saxon civilization is in the color of its skin. Is that not a terrible mistake? De-civilization can go on under white skin. The brutish and the ineffectual are not all black. "This is a white man's country." Yes, but suppose we try awhile regarding that as a fact that doesn't have to be protested. It may be true today and yet another day true without meaning much. Russia is a white man's country. The question we want to keep more to the fore is, "What kind of a white man's country is it?" To pray and labor that we white men who rule this land shall show a civilization guaran-

teed in the quality of its citizenship, able to look all problems in the face in the poise and temper of Washington and Lee, and able to prepare our sons and daughters for even greater work, is the loyalty the South needs in her sons, and the task of those who shall promote white supremacy along really unchallengeable lines.

I believe that there is a general desire for agreement awaiting the touch of opportunity. I believe that there is under the froth of agitation and variant individual opinion a common sense and a common will that can be ascertained and pronounced. I believe that there is, in a land and among a people as responsive as ours to the standards of the Christian Gospel, a conscience to support a program of basic righteousness.

The situation of the Negroes now after forty years brings again to the white men of the South the problem, larger, more perplexed, it is true, but essentially the same which was presented to them directly following the close of the war between the States. May we have the wisdom to understand duty as well as the men of that troubled hour understood it.

In Georgia in 1866 there were four hundred thousand Negroes. Between their emancipation and their enfranchisement there were three years in which they were here not slaves, for the old order had passed away with the stroke of Abraham Lincoln's pen, nor citizens and voters, for the new experiment had not yet been inaugurated by Thaddeus Stevens. Therefore, they were without a status in the body politic. What did Georgia do? Her legislature of 1866, amid the roaring of the wreckage, devoted itself to the manifest common sense of statesmanship by providing a special series of laws for the establishment of a status for "People of Color." Simple, clear and conceived in Christian conscience, those laws aimed no harsh blow, but gave expression to the sense of Anglo-Saxon responsibility to a confused race that stood in need of the strong hand of kindness and guidance. Of course these statutes passed away with the 14th and 15th Amendments to the Federal Constitution, but standing the other day with that old law book in my hand, I said to the group of Supreme Court judges in the room: "If Georgia and the South could have been left to fulfill the spirit of this little book in the adjustment of race relations, how much happier everybody

would have been. There would have been no Atlanta Massacre of September 22, 1906." But look at what that book says to us. In the providence of God and the course of events we are here now in the South confronting a similar situation, the Negroes not voters but freemen. The relative conditions are not greatly changed. If the Negroes are more numerous and more intelligent, the white people are also relatively more numerous, richer and more powerful. Is there no appeal here to thoughtful Southerners to move in an effort, at least, to promote something that moves in the direction of a Southern program?

Do we fear that the North would protest it and make new wounds? The North and the sentiment of the Northern man now in the Presidency, stand for it, are anxious for the South to do this thing. Do we fear that the Negro would resist such an understanding and such conditions as the best conscience of the South would lay down? On the contrary, every Negro who owns a dollar's worth of property and every Negro leader who is making conscience of his responsibility and who knows that an understanding is sorely needed, would welcome it. It proposes on the larger scale the policy the individual white man pursues with the individual Negro associated with him in any business relation, the policy of a definite understanding from which peace and mutual advantage can result.

Mr. Rhodes, the editor of the *Birmingham News*, a citizen of great weight in Alabama, had a cook named Nancy. She had been long with him and his household and they loved her and she loved them,—one of those beautiful situations so frequently found even yet in the South.

"I believe," he said, "that Nancy would today go out and bare her bosom to the storm for us, and we are devoted to her. But some little while ago Nancy got wrong. Our relations became strained. She was unpleasant, difficult, offensive, impossible. So it seemed that we would have to let her go, and this was a grief to all in the house. But I said have I done the square thing by her? Somebody has put foolish notions in her head. Ought I not to have a plain talk with her? So the next morning I sought her and showed just what was going on and what the conditions were for her best interests, and then I said, 'If you will abide by those conditions which are right, we will go on as

we have always been; if not, then you must get you another home." As he related the story his eyes were moist. "And what did Nancy do?" I asked. "Oh, before I got through she was crying and she has been all right ever since."

A Southern program would clear the air. It would promote confidence and discourage confusing discussion. It would give reassurance to the Negro leaders and point the direction of their energies into lines of progress parallel instead of diametric. It would issue an influence of restraint upon the lawlessness of irresponsible white people and tend to draw them to the better levels of public opinion. It would create an era of current instead of the present era of eddies, a period of construction instead of confusion. It would lay down a line in sympathy with which the press, the pulpit, and the teacher's desk would begin to hew with definite intent. There is no interest in the South not the gainer by such a policy.

Is such a program possible? I believe it is. Scores of the leaders in Southern thought have confirmed its possibility in their judgments. Several sons of the South who are men of large wealth have so believed in its possibility and practical value as to place in responsible hands their written agreement to pay every expense attached to the securing of some representative Southern Commission to seek the formulation of such a program. The effort to arouse the interest of leading Southerners has met with discouragement at the hands of no disinterested and impartial man to whom it has been submitted, and that its idea will sooner or later become incorporated in practical action, I do not doubt for a moment.

Lafcadio Hearn*

BY HERBERT VAUGHAN ABBOTT,

Associate Professor of English in Smith College

"The intention of such part of this book as is my own is to give a history of the circumstances under which a great man developed his genius. I have purposely ignored all such episodes as seemed impertinent to this end, as from my point of view there seems a sort of gross curiosity in raking among such details of a man's life as he himself would wish ignored. These I gladly leave to those who enjoy such labours."

These words give the gist of the preface to Miss Elizabeth Bisland's tactful and altogether charming biography of Lafcadio Hearn. No doubt they are forced from her by the peculiarities of her task. For Hearn's life during a number of years was of the bohemian sort that gives much cause for offense and, if reports be true, his conversation among his friends savored, at times, pretty frankly of his manner of living. But he was one of those rare artists who, in the creation of what he somewhere calls the literary personality, can drop a side of their nature and yet give a true, though not full or big, expression of themselves. The merest girl can read him—even of his joy in the beauty of woman, in the sound of her voice, in the magic of her presence—and find no offense. For none is there. Either he wrote for publication only of those scenes and incidents in which his pleasures were the purest delight to him or else the dipping of the pen into the ink put all other thoughts to flight. What Miss Bisland has given us, therefore, is undoubtedly a partial presentation—for it, too, can be read by the merest girl—but within its field—perhaps the only significant field with Hearn—it is not only delicate and penetrating in its sympathy, acute in its psychology, but an honest picture of the somewhat ethereal, not altogether substantial, artist in the man.

Lafcadio was a waif and so no region can claim him for his own. But his genius was wholly meridional. He was born in the Ionian Island, Leucadia—whence Lafcadio—of a Greek

*Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn. By Elizabeth Bisland. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906, 2 vols., vii., 475, 554 pp.

mother. She was probably of a fiery race, for her husband, the Irish Surgeon Major Hearn, had had, it is said, to run the ambush of two angry brothers and had once been left for dead before he had succeeded in winning her as his bride. Their boy was six years old when England restored the Ionian Islands to Greece, and the parents settled in Ireland. A year later the wife disappeared, the exact cause of her flight now shrouded in mystery, but the boy always spiritualized her memory and delighted to associate the rites and superstitions of her Greek faith with her memory. A dozen years under a Roman Catholic aunt of a fanatical intensity disposed him in later life to the delusion that he was under the displeasure of the Roman Church and dogged by its agents. Then he drifted to London, drifted, a half-famished boy of nineteen, to New York, and, in 1871, then just twenty-one, found himself in Cincinnati.

Here he was successively a type-setter, proof-reader, public librarian's private secretary, and newspaper reporter. Here he produced his first notable feat in description. Hauled in ropes to the arms of the cross of St. Peter's Cathedral, "he returned," says Miss Bisland, "to write an article that enabled all the town to see the great panorama through his myopic eyes, which yet could bear testimony to color and detail not obvious to clearer vision." Here also he met the musical critic, Mr. Krehbiel, and with him began that search into folk songs and folk traditions which was to characterize so large a part of his intellectual curiosity. Then, with motives as undivulged as those of his mother many years before, he dropped out of Cincinnati. Perhaps his morbid sensitiveness had been hurt in some chance way. Perhaps the waif spirit in him, that spirit which had all the qualities of homesickness except the definite desire of a home, impelled him. The next we know of him he is in New Orleans.

In New Orleans he still pursued his search for style and literary material. He labored for precise words and artistic phrases, sunk himself into a dangerous quarter of the city, among uncanny folk, till he had insinuated himself into its atmosphere and traditions. Two years he spent glorying in the tropical climate of Martinique and then, in 1890, he was off for Japan, under some commission of Harper & Brothers. A caprice made him break with them before he had written a word. He secured a govern-

ment position as a teacher of English, went from one college or university to another, married a Japanese lady, safeguarding her honor and rights with scrupulous chivalry, became the proud father of several children, devoted his best hours to his pupils—living meagerly the while—gave up all outside time to a series of books on what he believed to be the spirit of Japan, and died in 1904. In his obsequies, like Stevenson at Samoa, he was accorded the honors of a beloved interpreter.

Returned travelers testify that those who go to Japan and expect to find what Hearn has described there will be disappointed; but to discover his books for the first time after a visit is to get an impression of something vaguely recollected, of something after all local and Japanese. The charm of his descriptive sketches is not that they are accurate, but that they are genuine imagination, the ideas produced by an active but irregular observation. Through an accident in childhood, he lost the sight of one eye; the other, although, no doubt, it varied in power from time to time, was never good. "In writing and reading," says Miss Bisland, "he used a glass so large and heavy as to oblige him to have it mounted in a handle and to hold it to his eye like a lorgnette and for distant observation he carried a small, folded telescope." And his wife in her quaint English testifies: "With one glance of his nose glass which he keeps he catches the whole appearance of any first visitor even to the smallest detail of physiognomy. . . . The minute he takes a glance is the whole time of his observation, still his wonderfully keen observation often astonishes me."

Many of Hearn's most beautiful descriptions are of the sounds of Japan, particularly of her women's voices. He had an eager ear. As he listened to his wife's ghost stories in the evening it was like him to exclaim, "In what manner was *O Blood* exclaimed? In what manner of voice? What do you think of the sound of *geta* at that time?" And his stories show the skill with which he could convey such suggestions of tone to the reader. Yet his ear would never have proved of good service to a scientific experimenter. Men less sensitive were more accurate in getting a tune down on paper. And his wife is obliged to say of both sight and hearing: "Indeed, sometimes I thought he was mad, because he seemed too frequently he saw things that were

not and heard things that were not." But these very irregularities of his senses were a fortunate equipment to him as an artist. A rich brilliance of sensuous life, such as forced itself upon him in the West Indies, delighted but for the time stunned him. What he needed were fragmentary, or at least momentary, impressions. These his imagination, necessarily and almost involuntarily, perfected. He was not a man, like Maeterlink, to play tricks with his sensation; he took them in good faith. The charm of Hearn's books lies in their illusions; of the biography in his earnestness.

And here, for want of a better place, may come in the account of how once, on a lonely road in Tennessee, he saw a brute pick up a kitten that had got in the way, blind it and fling it from him with a laugh. Hearn, in the violence of his passion, pulled out his pistol and fired four times. "But, you know," he said, "my sight is so bad, I missed him;" and after a few moments added, "It has always been one of the regrets of my life that I missed." To those who have heard of the pathetic sensitiveness with which he tried to conceal his own imperfect eyes from notice, the story comes with especial poignancy. It gives a chance, too, to bear testimony to the habitual modesty of the man regarding his own achievements and to his reputation for truthfulness as he saw the truth. "I never knew him to tell a lie," testifies one who knew him long, "and it would take very strong evidence to make me believe that any account he gave of his own action was intended to deceive." If one takes the story, as I believe one should, as the honest statement of a modest man, it will forever prevent the unjust impression that Hearn was a *poseur*. As an actual fact he was thoroughly possessed of his ideas and counted no costs.

"Oh, for a life of sensations rather than of thoughts," exclaims Keats in one of his letters. But no sane writer, "eager to build a world in his own image," can ever rest with mere sensations, just as no sane reader can follow such a succession of mere sensations and remain sane. There must be form, coherence, development, and for this purpose there must be ideas to develop. Hearn's irrepressible craving to create a style impelled him to seek ideas; and as Time—its eras, its epochs, its æons—cast the greatest spell over his imagination, we find him irresistibly attracted to those facts and speculations which called up the past

and yet emphasized its distance. He is lured away from bread-and-butter getting by an old song, a folk story and every tradition and habit that gathers about a race. At times his search is a blind impulsion; at times it is so conscious as possibly to deceive a reader into thinking this intense literary ascetic is something of a charlatan.

"There are four things especially," he writes from New Orleans in 1883, "which enrich fancy,—mythology, history, romance, poetry,—the last being really the crystallization of all human desire after the impossible, the diamonds created by prodigious pressure of suffering. . . . In history I think one should only seek the extraordinary, the monstrous, the terrible; in mythology the most fantastic and sensuous, just as in romance. But there is one more absolutely essential study in the formation of a strong style—science. No romance equals it. If one can store up in his brain the most extraordinary facts of astronomy, geology, ethnology, etc., they furnish him with a wonderful and startling variety of images, symbols, and illustrations. With these studies I should think one could not help forging a good style at least—an impressive one certainly. I give myself five years more study; then I think I may be able to do something."

It was natural that Buddhism with its vast time sense, its doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, its extension of the individual personality to the distant past as well as to the distant future, should appeal to a man of Hearn's disposition with telling force. And, when for the first time—apparently in New Orleans—he discovered it, he was free to yield himself to its fascination. His wandering bohemian life had kept him absolutely untrammelled by any Christian habits of thought. And as for hesitating, scrutinizing, questioning, before accepting an alluring imaginative appeal, it is quite enough to say that Hearn was not of a judicial temper, nor had he a disciplined mind.

At first he seems to play with the ideas of soul transmigration, keeping just outside the circle of its spell. So, in 1889, he writes to Dr. Gould of Philadelphia:

"Just after I wrote you last night, something began to whiffle quite soundlessly round my head: I saw only a shadow, and I turned down the gas,—remembering that he who extinguisheth the light so that insects may not perish therein, shall, according to the book of Laotse,

obtain longer life and remission of sins. Then it struck me with its wings so heavily that I knew it was a bat,—for no bird could fly so silently; and I turned up the gas again,—full. There it was!—very large,—circling round and round the ceiling so swiftly that I felt dizzy trying to turn to keep it in sight,—and as noiselessly as its own shadow above it. I could not tell which was the shadow and which the life,—until both came together at last upon a ledge, and made a little peak-shouldered devilish thing with strangely twisted ears. . . .

I even found myself wondering, Who it could be? I thought it might be Clemence, about whose death I received news in my last letter. I did not think for a moment it was Gould. Only some very poor simple soul would avail itself of so humble a vehicle for apparition. . . . Then it looked so much like something damned as it moved about, that I felt ashamed of thinking it could be Clemence,—the best kind of old souls, Clemence!—My *blanchisseuse*. It was not easy to catch the bat without hurting it. I argued that if it was anybody I knew it could not be afraid of me. It sat on the mirror. It went under the table. It flattened under the trunk and feigned death. Then I caught it in my hat; and it revealed its plain nature by burying its teeth in my finger; and it would not let go,—and it squeaked and chattered like a ghost. I was almost mad enough to hurt it; but I tried to caress its head, which felt soft and nice. But it showed all its teeth and looked too ugly, and there was a musky smell of hell about it."

While Hearn was in New Orleans, engaged among other things in what he calls his Oriental studies, a friend introduced him to the works of Herbert Spencer. The result was enthusiasm. "When one has read Spencer," he exclaims, "one has digested the most nutritious portion of all human knowledge." And in another place his "mind gives us the greatest conception of Divinity I can yet expand to receive." "The slightest cavil raised" against Spencer's speculations, we are told, Hearn resented "as a sacrilege. It was hardly possible for him to retain old ties of friendship except with a few men whom he met on the plane of everyday life apart from the higher intellectual interests." Considering the painful obstacles he had to encounter in reading, it is marvelous how diligently he gave himself up to the voluminous pages of the philosopher. But he was quite incapable of reading him in a philosophic spirit. Artist-like, he selected the food he liked; he re-preportioned, ignored, exaggerated, re-colored, into everything read himself and his desires. In this way he summarizes Spencer:

"The physical fact about feelings and emotions is that they are inheritances, just as much as the colour of hair, or the size of limbs; and tastes—such as a taste for music or painting—are similarly inherited. They are outside of the individual experience as much as a birthmark. To explain fully why, would involve a lot of neurological scribbling,—but it is sufficient to say that as all feelings are the result of motions in nervous structure, the volume and character and kind of feeling is predetermined in each individual by the character of nerve-tissue and its arrangement and complexity. In no two individuals are the nervous structures exactly the same; and the differences in races or individuals are consequent upon the differences in quality, variety, and volume of ancestral experience shaping each life.

"The experience-hypothesis,' says Spencer, 'is inadequate to account for emotional phenomena. It is even more at fault in respect to the emotions than in respect to the cognitions. The doctrine that all the desires, all the sentiments, are generated by the experiences of the individual, is so glaringly at variance with facts that I wonder how anyone should ever have entertained it.' And he cites the multiform passions of the infant, displayed before there has been any such amount of experience as could possibly account for them.

"In short, there is no possible room for argument as to whether each particular character—with all its possibilities, intellectual or emotional—is not predetermined by the character of nervous structure, slowly evolved by millions of billions of experiences in the past. As the differences in the ancestral sums of experiences, so the differences in the psychical life. Varying enormously in races so widely removed as English and Japanese, it is impossible to believe that any feeling in one race is exactly paralleled by any feeling in the other. It is equally impossible to think that the feelings of a Japanese child can be the same as those of an English child born in Japan. Amazing physical proof to the contrary would be afforded by a comparative study of the two nervous structures.

"To say, therefore, that the sight of a toy—adjusted exactly by the experience of the race to the experience of the individual—produces on the mind of a Japanese child the same impression it would produce on the mind of an English child born in Japan and brought up by Japanese only, would be to deny all our modern knowledge of biology, psychology, and even physiology. The pleasure of the Japanese child in its toy is the pleasure of the dead."

To most of us, the transition from the doctrine that acquired characteristics may be inherited to the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul seems a long leap, but the eagerness to reconcile what he chose to consider the last word of science with what he felt to be the profoundest of religions makes the marked difference no great obstacle to the darting imagination of Hearn.

To the crudely literal interpretation of transmigration, to be sure, he lends only an imaginative sympathy. Yet he feels its force. He says: "When you find children who do wrong are always warned, 'Ah! your future birth will be unhappy;' when you find two lovers drinking death together and leaving behind them letters, saying, 'This is the influence of our last birth, when we broke our promise to become husband and wife;' and last, but not least, when some loving woman murmurs, laughingly: 'In the last life thou wert a woman and I a man, and I loved thee much: but thou didst not love me at all,'—you begin to doubt if you do not really believe like everybody else."

With these fascinating superstitions of the Orient he must find some peaceful *modus vivendi* for himself. His fancy is of such sort that they cannot play upon it without teasing him into some approximation to acquiescence. "Perpetually," he says, "we eat the dust of our race—the substance of our former selves." That seems to him a first step toward a modern, enlightened Buddhism. The diabolical bay of a vagrant Oriental dog with "the goblin mockery of her laughing tones" and "the piteous agony of her wailing ones" seems to him the echo of all her ancestors, their habits come back to life, and thus their ghosts. That instances a second step. But the reader must be prepared for one still more extended. "I cannot rid myself," he says in one of the most visionary among his sketches, "of the notion that Matter, in some blind infallible way, *remembers* and that in every unit of living substance there slumber infinite potentialities simply because to every ultimate atom belongs the infinite and indestructible experience of billions of vanished universes."

So, through the consciousness of the atom, the external claims of science and the inner impulse to religion are reconciled and the weighty and encyclopædic Spencer is made to mount lightly into the temple of Buddha. Among Hearn's later writings is the story of a Pilgrim who climbs wearily a vast mountain of skulls, only to find at the pinnacle, that every skull "in some one of the billions of his former lives" has been his own, "the nest of his dreams and delusions and desires." The tale is told with far more elevation of style than is that of the ghostly bat in his American lodging, for such tales have now become parables and to Hearn's devoted soul foreshadow truth.

When people declined to take his ideas seriously, he received the rebuff with a pang and set to work with renewed ardor, not to re-examine his theories, but to make them more expressive. Unable to test the temper of his steel, he devoted himself to polishing its surface. Yet it is not a superficial thing for him—this search for style. "Our most powerful feelings," he says in a letter, "are inherited accumulations of feeling and the multiplicity of them—superimposed one upon another—blurs them and makes them dim, even though enormously increasing their strength." The search for style is the search for the phrase that will reveal the deepest of these varied feelings to one's self and so perhaps to others. In New Orleans, he testifies: "I write a rough sketch and labor it over and over again for half a year at intervals of ten minutes leisure—sometimes I get a day or two. The work done each time is small, but with the passing of the seasons, the massing becomes noticeable, perhaps creditable." Later in Japan he declines a chance for fellowship with a dear friend in the words, "I must work, work, work, while the scythe is sharpening within vision." And again he writes: "I think that could I create something I felt to be sublime, I should feel also that the Unknowable had selected me for a mouthpiece, for a medium of utterance, in the high cycling of its eternal purpose, and I should know the pride of the prophet that had seen God face to face."

As was natural to an artist so extremely sensitive, Hearn's ideal of a good style changed with his surroundings. In New Orleans, he seeks for warmth of color and richness of imagery, he is under the spell of Gautier's voluptuous delicacy and elfish ingenuity. He admires the great god Pan, so audaciously alive and unashamed. He loves exotic phrases. He familiarizes himself with etymological dictionaries and thesauruses to gain "that subtle sense of words to which much that *startles* in poetry and prose is due." But in Japan the chief influence upon his style is his own tireless labor of love as an interpreter to his students, his ardent desire to give them of the Occident in such fashion as not to impair their reverence for the antique spirit of their race, its images and habits of mind. He grows suspicious of his old theory that art, free from all considerations of morality, should run its own race, be the goal what it may. He grows confident that "poetry which cannot be translated is not even true poetry."

It is mere playing with words." The verses of Japan, simple, concise, epigrammatic, the acute expressions of one transient, unanalyzable emotion color his judgment. He wishes to create a story of which the reader cannot skip a single paragraph—"no descriptions, no preliminaries, no explanations—nothing but the feeling itself at the highest intensity. . . . The less material, the more force; the subtler the power, the greater, as water than land, as wind than water, as mind than wind."

Hence came the book of tales called *Kwaidan*. "These ghostly sketches," says Miss Bisland, "might have been made by the brush of a Japanese artist, a gray whirl of water about a phantom fish—a shadow of a pine bough across the face of a spectral moon—brief, almost childishly simple and yet suggesting things poignant, things ineffable." The reader may test the validity of Miss Bisland's statements by two fragments from a similar book of tales called *Kotto*. They are as follows:

"Have you ever attempted to mount some old tower stairway, spiraling up through darkness, and in the heart of that darkness found yourself at the cobwebbed edge of nothing? Or have you followed some coast path, cut along the face of a cliff, only to discover yourself, at a turn, on the jagged verge of a break? The emotional worth of such experience—from a literary point of view—is proved by the force of the sensations aroused, and by the vividness with which they are remembered.

"Now there have been curiously preserved, in old Japanese story-books, certain fragments of fiction that produce an almost similar emotional experience. . . . Perhaps the writer was lazy; perhaps he had a quarrel with the publisher; perhaps he was suddenly called away from his little table, and never came back; perhaps death stopped the writing-brush in the very middle of a sentence. But no mortal man can ever tell us exactly why these things were left unfinished. . . . I select a typical example.

"He was raising the cup to his lips when he suddenly perceived, in the transparent yellow infusion, the image or reflection of a face that was not his own. Startled, he looked around, but could see no one near him. The face in the tea appeared, from the coiffure, to be the face of a young *samurai*: it was strangely distinct, and very handsome,—delicate as the face of a girl. And it seemed the reflection of a *living* face; for the eyes and the lips were moving. Bewildered by this mysterious apparition, Sekinai threw away the tea, and carefully examined the cup. It proved to be a very cheap water-cup, with no artistic devices of any sort. He

found and filled another cup; and again the face appeared in the tea. He then ordered fresh tea, and refilled the cup; and once more the strange face appeared,—this time with a mocking smile. But Sekinai did not allow himself to be frightened. 'Whoever you are,' he muttered, 'you shall delude me no further!'—then he swallowed the tea, face and all, and went his way, wondering whether he had swallowed a ghost."

It is perhaps well to let Lafcadio Hearn vanish from these pages in some fashion as ghostly. But will he vanish from our library? His theories, even the very religion that seemed to keep him so relentlessly at work, are the mere shadows of dreams. But how many poets and stylists have there not been who have been allured by mere surface appearances, have come to their convictions as impulsively and have found in their own caprice of taste what they took to be a universal truth. And the reward of their devotion, as it may perhaps be his, is their perpetual charm.

The Silent South

By JOHN CARLISLE KILGO,
President of Trinity College

Between the Potomac River and the Rio Grande lies a vast stretch of territory which we call the South. Within its borders is an area of more than 818,000 square miles, inhabited by more than 25,000,000 people. Of this region Henry Grady once said: "It is the home of a brave and hospitable people. There, is centered all that can please or prosper humankind. A perfect climate, above a fertile soil, yields to the husbandman every product of the temperate zone. . . . There, are mountains stored with exhaustless treasures; forests, vast and primeval, and rivers that, tumbling or loitering, run wanton to the sea."

On the banks of one of these Southern rivers, three hundred years ago, a small company of daring Englishmen established the first permanent English community on this continent. To the little squadron, as it sailed down the Thames, Michael Drayton said,

"Go, and in regions far such heroes bring forth
As those from whom we come."

To this high sentiment the poet dedicated the expedition, a sentiment that has been realized in not a few of the noblest characters that have added lustre to our American history.

But here in the South we have had a strange and, in no small sense, a tragic history. An unerring Providence in distributing their proper work to nations and races has appointed to the South not a few of the hardest tasks that have fallen to the lot of mankind. Some of these tasks are entirely unique in their history and exceedingly complex in their nature. If American history is a gigantic experiment with the problems which no ancient race could solve, but which must be solved by some race, if here on this continent is being put to a supreme test the genius of man in the affairs of a sound government and a lasting civilization, then by every token it is plain that no small part of the work has fallen to the South.

I do not give place to any of the gloomy doubts which some

men entertain as to the outcome of the South in meeting its grave responsibilities in America's mission. On the contrary I rejoice in the full hope and in the assurance of a strong faith that in the end its tasks will be performed. The magnitude of the work may discourage some, periods of great strain may at times hinder progress, and the pessimist may have his times of supremacy, but I still hold to the belief that our Southern land will make good in our nation's destiny. To support this faith and inspire this hope there are a multitude of signs that bear witness to the wisdom and industry of Southern manhood.

Those who know the South only from what they have seen through the window of a Pullman car, or from what they have learned from a certain class of speakers and writers, are yet in great, I feel like saying hopeless, ignorance of this mighty section of our country and the wealth of citizenship that lives and labors in it. I do not cringe under unjust criticisms, and those who form hasty judgments on few facts, or on distorted representations, I tolerate because they are to be pitied.

There is a great unknown South. It is not a spectacular South, it is not a talking South, it is a working South. It is animated with high ideals, encouraged with an unflinching faith, moved by a mighty impulse of energy, and happy in the enjoyment of victories already won. If one would know it, if one would understand its soul, he must go away into the broad fields where sturdy farmers are making things grow out of the dirt; he must go back into the deep forests where mills are turning out millions of lumber; he must go away into the mountains where the miners are bringing forth piles of ore; he must go into stores and banks and factories and there he will find an army of workers too busy to talk and too seriously engaged to make a parade of themselves.

This unknown, working South has been and is bringing things to pass. Four decades ago all was worse than ruin. Thousands conquered by a despair born of wretched conditions shook Southern dust from their feet and sought homes in other regions, while millions remained to rebuild the places of their desolate land. The story of their heroic faith is well told in the marvelous wealth that has been created by their busy hands. During the past year, 1906, the wealth of the South was increased every day more than seven millions of dollars, more than the wealth of

Great Britain increased in every seven days. At the close of the Civil War the wealth of the Southern States was reckoned to be four billions of dollars; today it is reckoned at more than twenty billions of dollars. From an agricultural region it has become a region of all sorts of industries, growing more rapidly in its manufacturing enterprises than in any other line of industry.

A people who, under such unparalleled circumstances, have wrought out such marvelous results have proved in the most tangible way their right to the admiration and the confidence of all mankind. Assuredly they have set a new standard in industry for all nations. They have illustrated the might of a determined race, and furnished in their record an inspiration for all brave people. It is to this army of heroic and sturdy workers that the lovers of the South look for the final solution of all Southern problems and the security of Southern progress.

But as wonderful as have been these industrial changes, as amazing as has been this material resuscitation, they do not show all the progress and all the changes that have been going on. The South has been steadily growing in all things. And now that the strain of poverty has been relieved, more and more attention will be given to other phases of social welfare. Already education is receiving increasing attention and its advancement is engaging the thought and efforts of industrial leaders. And there are many signs that political and social questions will receive in the future the studious attention of thoughtful and public-spirited people. There is going on a marked change in many of the sentiments that have had sway, and this change of sentiment is not confined to one class, but is apparent in many classes of citizens.

I grant that the extent of this change in sentiment cannot be estimated by the spirit and the sentiments that still seem to have leadership in Southern politics. Yet I know, as all men know who have taken the pains to observe, that the ultra and inflammatory spirit of a certain type of Southern politician no longer voices the faith of the thinking and the working South; that methods and issues which have in the past had the sympathy and the patronage of Southern citizens, no longer appeal to their judgment. The working South has grown tired of the practice of manufacturing issues for the exigencies of a campaign period.

They are too serious to believe longer that statesmanship should waste its energies on vagaries and that social turmoil is a paying investment. For twenty-five years my duties have given me friendly association with the best classes of business men in both towns and country, and the one thing which I have observed among them all is a secret and growing dissatisfaction with the spirit and the methods and the aims of professional politics. What is now silent will one day speak. For in every reformation sentiments change long before they express themselves in action.

What the working South wants is a leadership that will voice its faiths and its hopes and its sympathies. These faiths and hopes and sympathies are not spiteful, they are not partisan, they are not malicious, they are not reactionary. They are broad and generous and brave and patriotic. The day has passed when the intelligent and busy South will applaud sectional spite and enjoy inflammatory speech. The stern demands of business call for rational thought and deliberate judgment, and what does not commend itself to the sober reason of serious men will not secure their sympathy and their service.

A Southern senator who makes a specialty of "sassing Yankees" deeply humiliates the high moral sense of the best classes of men in all parts of the South. His performances may delight himself. And no doubt there is a Southern class that applauds his sectional utterances. But it represents only the decay of Southern politics. It has departed far from the patriotic and moral spirit of that body of noble men who came out of the strifes and pains of the Civil War and, amid scenes of incomparable trials, spoke words of living hope and gave those splendid examples of broad statesmanship that do them immortal honor.

At the most critical and trying moment in our Southern history, Robert E. Lee, instead of nursing a bitter resentment, said to his suffering countrymen: "The interests of the State are therefore the same as those of the United States. Its prosperity will rise or fall with the welfare of the country. The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of war, and to restore the blessings of peace. They should remain, if possible, in the country; promote harmony and good feelings; qualify themselves to vote; and elect to the state and general legislature wise

and patriotic men, who will devote their abilities to the interests of the country, and the healing of all dissensions."

The patriotic sentiments which at that crucial period inspired his brave spirit found a response in the faith and deeds of other Southern leaders who, at that time, guided the affairs of the South. Lamar, in his eloquent eulogy upon Charles Sumner, rose to the full height of an American statesman and did honor to his Southern countrymen when he said: "Would that the spirit of the illustrious dead whom we lament today could speak from the grave to both parties to this deplorable discord in tones which should reach each and every heart throughout this broad territory: 'My countrymen! *know* one another, and you will *love* one another.'" That this deep-souled Southerner in that moment was not swept away by an unconscious cant is amply proved by all his utterances and deeds. In Congress he said: "The motive which prompts me is one which has been the law of my career since I have been in Congress. It is my desire to see the pacification of these sections—to see my people of the South restored to the proud position of dignity and equality in this Union to which, under the constitution, they are entitled; and to do that it is necessary that these Representatives of the North, and if not they, then their constituencies, the people of the North, should become satisfied of the longing and desire of our people to live with them in peace and perpetuity in a restored and fraternal Union. Before that cherished purpose and inspiration all others with me sink into insignificance." It was in the Senate he declared, "For my part, I say that I would leave no legitimate effort unused and no constitutional means unemployed which would give to every human being in this country that highest title to American citizenship: virtue, knowledge, and judgment."

Did not Benjamin H. Hill, speaking to an audience in New York, voice the same patriotic sentiment when he said: "There was a South of slavery—that South is dead. There is a South of union and freedom—that South, thank God, is living, breathing, growing every hour?"

No intelligent man ever questioned the fullness and the genuineness of the love of Senator Vance for all men, regardless of their social and financial stations. The genuineness of his love of them needs no greater proof than the wisdom he spoke to them and

the persistent loyalty with which he served them. "Instead," said he, "of fostering bitterness and devoting politics to those small prejudices which are calculated to carry a ward or a township primary, I beg your recognition of that wiser and nobler policy which seeks to make every spark of genius, every arm of strength, every heart of integrity, and every soul of fire in America contributory to the strengthening of freedom, and the glory of the great Republic." And who ever gave more wholesome advice to young Southern men than he did in an address at the University of North Carolina. He said to those young students; "Let it ever be before your eyes, and learn of it. Among other wise things, that the yielding to blind passions and personal resentments, when the happiness of thousands is entrusted to your judgment, is a *crime* for which God will hold you responsible."

The one note that sounded through the words of Gordon and Hampton and Ransom and their colleagues in places of trust and responsibility, the one spirit which they sought to inspire in Southern youth, and the one direction in which they labored with patience to lead their people were to a stronger union, a deeper peace, and an abiding fraternity. Who will now stand up to say that men who strive to rekindle old fires of sectionalism, who seem to have an inordinate desire for dissension, who exert their every energy to intensify racial malice, and who would make political gain at the expense of national confidence, are worthy successors of Lee and Lamar, Vance and Gordon, Hampton and their kind? Far better that Southern patriots return to the sentiments and the faiths of those leaders who, at the time of the South's greatest distress, pointed out the way to union and did their people the high honor to appeal to their reason instead of their blinded passions.

What the silent and working South wants is a leadership endowed with the wisdom and the broad statesmanship of these men, a leadership that will interpret the soul of the South's progress. It wants national pathfinders. Not a set of insincere manipulators who flatter its weaknesses, who gratify its shallowest desires, and who foster irrational prejudices, but men who know what their people should believe and what they should do. Men of wide vision who take within their view all movements and

who can inspire their people to obey the eternal laws of truth and justice and mercy.

Among the qualities which the silent South will require of its leaders, I mention three:

1. A clear and unyielding regard for the principles of righteousness. The silent South has a strong moral sense. The Southern people have always had an implicit faith in God and in the Bible as the revealed will of God, and this religious faith has steadily resisted all tendencies to infidelity. But candor requires me to say that hitherto in political affairs moral claims too often have been set aside. Policies and deeds that outrage righteousness have been condoned upon the most frivolous grounds, while in elections shameful evils have been practiced without just condemnation. Private standards of morality have not been applied to public questions, and what one would not do himself he has tolerated in the multitude. However, I rejoice to believe that there is going on a wholesome change that will replace the doctrine of expediency with the standard of righteousness.

Nor would I be understood as intimating that this is an evil peculiar to the South. It is as peculiar to one section of this republic as it is to another. It seems to be one of the inherent dangers of our form of government, and calls upon all citizens to exercise perpetual care lest designing men gamble away our national hopes. It is a painful fact that there is not an American city or an American commonwealth that has not had its political scandals and its periods of political decay.

But that there is going on a reformation in the South that demands a higher standard in public affairs is evident from many signs. There is a growing outcry against all irregularities in elections, there is an increasing demand for the security of the courts against mere prejudices, there is a healthful sentiment in favor of a just administration of law, and there is a strong resistance to the deeds of the mob. However horrible was the recent riot in Atlanta the widespread outcry against it by all the intelligent and moral citizens of Atlanta and throughout the South, and the bankruptcy of the paper whose wild utterances did so much to bring on the riot, show the rising protest against mobocracy. In every part of the South there is a determined

feeling that the time has come when law shall be obeyed and society made secure against the outbreaks of the mob.

The steady and quiet growth of the number of independent voters in the South is another token of the unwillingness of thoughtful and serious men to act longer in public matters without due regard for their personal rights and their personal responsibilities. This vote does not represent a tendency, certainly at this time, to organize another political party, but it does represent a stubborn determination to express one's own mind and to take seriously the privileges of American citizenship in the exercise of suffrage. The scratching of tickets at elections is steadily increasing not only among more intelligent voters, but among voters of all classes. This practice is a method of serving notice upon all party managers that they must reckon with a sense of American liberty when they arrange their plans and calculate their resources. The old system of vituperation and persecution will no longer make serious men serve party wishes regardless of personal judgment.

The Solid South in itself is not an evil. If it is made solid by despotic methods, if it acts together from unrighteous motives, then, by every standard of sound morals, it is shameful, and also subversive of all the high ideals of American freedom. But if its unity springs from an agreement in the intelligent exercise of individual judgment, if it is the result of a sound and true comprehension of right, then its solidity is an honor. If the South remains solid, if its solidity is desirable, those who lead must have regard in the future for principles approved by reason and not for passions that may be aroused by imaginary evils.

Another gratifying evidence of this wholesome reform going on among busy men of the South is an outspoken protest against any tendency toward socialistic legislation and the reckless policies of the demagogue. Perhaps this spirit has been best expressed in a recently published letter of a business man in a leading Southern city. He said: "It is high time, indeed, that the press of this state should raise its voice in protest and lend its energies to the crushing out of a false leadership that is constantly inflaming and leading the people on to the goal of socialism, confiscation, anarchy and ruin. Some of these leaders are, no doubt, sincere in their misguided purpose; but the most of them are demagogues

who seek to ride into lucrative office upon the crest of the wave of misconception." Commenting on this, the *Charlotte Observer* says: "This is the cry to which every true North Carolinian must respond—whether we must try to do something for the state or continue to answer to the whip of the little coterie which is striving to beat us into its corral—which means revenge or the gratification of ambition to it, but nothing good to North Carolina."

This is but a sample of a multitude of expressions of the growing demand for a leadership that will regard the principles of righteousness and the welfare of the commonwealth more than it regards the exigencies of a party. It is an assurance that partyism is coming to an end, that patriotic and working citizens no longer will submit to the assumption that a party is above the state and that a political platform is superior to the state's constitution. Nor does this growing sentiment simply require that leaders shall have a disposition to do the right; they must have the ability to discern and defend the right. Mere generalities, proclaimed with a vehemence born of an ignorance of facts united to the passions of a blind moral impulse, may pass for eloquence, but they will not be accepted as statesmanship.

2. The future leader of the South must believe in and heartily defend the cause of mankind. This is, in substance, what Archbishop Ireland says is the fundamental idea of democracy, and when I say it must be one of the qualities of the future leader in the South, I intend to say that he must represent a sane and moral democracy. For I do not believe that there is in any other section of our nation a more determined faith in the cause and the principles of democracy than there is among Southern people. From the beginning they have been quick to resent any seeming invasion of their rights and to resist any tendency toward a spirit of centralized power. Taking advantage of this virtuous sensitiveness designing men have abused it by making it serve their unholy projects. They have vehemently pretended to defend the masses against falsely proclaimed dangers of culture and success, and, on these waves of resentment, they have been carried into places of honor and responsibility for which they had no essential fitness.

Within the last decade and a half democracy has been distorted

into all sorts of follies and ugly deformities. Instead of its holding to the fundamental principle of the rights of all men, it has been reduced to the degeneracy of party prejudice and class hatred. "The masses, the people," whoever these terms may refer to, have been made to stand for a despotism as intolerant as an ancient oligarchy. "The people" have been used by demagogues as instruments of torture, and to threaten with their revenge has been the final argument of force. And all this has been done in the name of democracy as though it exalted poverty above wealth, ignorance above learning, coarseness above refinement, and failure above success. It is the glory of democracy that it gives every man a chance to rise, it is its shame that one having attained success becomes the object of popular venom.

Such a distorted democracy can never have the sympathy of the silent South. What it wants is a leadership that will espouse the cause of all men and administer to them their just dues; a leadership that has confidence in the successful and will encourage the struggling; a leadership that can inspire social sympathies and engender feelings of social fraternity. It is tired beyond patience with the falsehoods and spleen of the political ranter, whose only message is one of hate and whose only aim is perpetual confusion.

If asked what bearing this will have on the bi-racial question, I answer that I believe it will have the most beneficial influence in putting this question in its right relation. It is not my purpose to discuss the negro problem. However, I am sure that the sentiments of Senator Tillman, Governor Vardaman, and the "Clansman" do not represent the sentiment of the best people who belong to the silent and working South. The silent South of both races knows that there are inherent differences between the two races, and that these differences have settled certain social questions. These phases of the question are settled, except with a few who do not seem to know it. All that remains to be done is to see that the negro has a fair chance to develop himself, and this chance the future leader will be required to accord him. Having no faith in the existence of the so-called "negro problem" the silent South is growing more and more disgusted with the ceaseless effort to create a fictitious strife between the races, and

it wants a leadership that sees less of racial warfare and more of material, educational, and religious prosperity for all people.

3. The third quality which the leader of the South must possess is the spirit of nationalism. It has been said often that the South is provincial. This is a chronic criticism of the South. Even some Southern speakers and writers have made much of it. I do not deny that the Southerners are provincial. All people are, except Arabs and wandering gypsies. I do not believe that the South is any more provincial than New England, or that Charleston is more provincial than Boston. Provincialism is peculiar to all sections of our country and all sections of other countries.

In the South we have our Southern sun and flowers and forests and rivers and songs and faiths and ideals. A true Southerner loves them all. Nor does he think it treason to love them. He fails to see that he should forget Lee in order to admire Lincoln, that he should turn from King's Mountain if he would esteem Concord, that he should think little of Southern traditions if he would rightly value the traditions of the North. Provincialism is the guardian of local history, it is the security of local character. More than these, it is the tap-root of patriotism, for patriotism is local love radiating into every region of one's country.

I do not blush to own that the South is provincial, but I would have its provincialism to flower into nationalism, not into sectionalism. By every right the Southern people hold membership in this great American nation, nor do I believe that there can be found in any other region of the republic a stronger sense of loyalty to it than that which abides in the souls of the men of the silent South. They are Americans, and Americans without apology and without explanation. Holding in deathless esteem the heroic spirit with which their fathers contended for what they deemed just and wise, they rejoice in the assurance that this nation is an unbroken union to which has been committed the promotion of the freedom of mankind.

The spirit of sectionalism is an anti-American spirit. It is the mother of evil, a thing to be hated wherever it may abide. It is as ugly in the North and in the West as it is in the South. A United States senator from Massachusetts or from Ohio, in whose spirit burns the flame of sectionalism, is as distasteful to the silent

South as a sectional senator from a Southern state. The Americans of the North and of the East and of the West and of the South have met in the busy fields of industry, they have united their capital for the development of their country's resources, they have confidence in each other's character, and they are bound together by bonds of a national welfare. The discordant notes of sectionalism are wholly displeasing to the silent and the working South, as they are to genuine Americans in every region of the nation, and the Southern leader of the future must be an active defender of the nation's rights instead of a small and spiteful obstructionist in the interest of sectional bigotry.

The South has found its place in the nation's mission, and more and more will it give of its influence and power for the nation's progress. Here are to be built up those resources of civilization peculiar to the life of the South, and from them the nation will draw a strength for its own life as well as for the tasks committed to it. I have unlimited faith in the integrity of the silent South. My only complaint is that it has been too long silent. The hour has struck when it should speak, when it should rise in its patriotic might and play its part in all the affairs of society.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES

LEE'S CENTENNIAL. An Address by Charles Francis Adams. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1907,—76 pp.

LIFE OF ROBERT EDWARD LEE. By Henry E. Shepherd. New York and Washington: The Neale Publishing Company, 1906,—280 pp.

The most noteworthy of the many celebrations of the centenary of General Lee's birth was held at Washington and Lee University; and of the addresses made on that occasion the most notable was that by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, of Boston. Although the address had wide publicity in the press at the time of its delivery, it is eminently proper that it should be preserved in permanent form. While there is nothing especially new in it, for Mr. Adams has written and spoken about Lee before, the words have all the greater significance when the occasion is taken into consideration. There is no better evidence of the change of opinion that is going on in the North today with regard to the Civil War in general, and Lee in particular, than this magnanimous and sympathetic treatment of Lee—all the more significant when it is considered that Mr. Adams by heredity, birth, and environment is identified with New England, and that as a Federal soldier he would have rejoiced at any time had he heard of the death of Lee.

It is a long way from Mr. Adams when he says, "I would myself have done exactly what Lee did if I had been in his place," back to Charles Sumner who placed him "high in the catalogue of those who have imbrued their hands in their country's blood" and handed him over to "the avenging pen of History." Aside from the catholic point of view that is evident throughout the whole address the special features may be said to be: the treatment of the causes that led to the Civil War from the historical, sociological, and human standpoint, rather than from the abstract, legal, and technical; the discussion of the Gettysburg campaign in which Mr. Adams disagrees with most historians; the presentation of the decline of the cotton industry in the South leading to the complete exhaustion of the Southern army; and the folly of denying to Lee the right of suffrage which was conferred on his manumitted slaves.

It might have been hoped that Lee's centenary would bring forth a biography written with the same fairness and historical spirit as Mr. Adams's address. It is generally conceded that no altogether satisfactory life of Lee has yet been written: there have been collections of his letters and rather hastily composed lives, but none that has done justice to the subject. Certainly Dr. Shepherd has failed to supply the deficiency. The title of the book is misleading, for instead of a well knit biography we have rather loosely constructed chapters on Lee as a Man, as a Soldier, as a Husband and Father, and Lee at Lexington. It is arranged in the same general form as the life by Dr. J. William Jones, but it is not nearly so satisfactory. It is inferior to Long's "Life of Lee" and suffers by comparison with the "Recollections and Letters of Lee" by his son. One comes from a reading of the book without feeling that any new light has been thrown on Lee, or that even old facts have been handled with skill and with judgment. The author has a marked tendency to state certain obvious truths before making a specific statement. While literary allusion is one of the charms of good writing, surely it is carried too far when one finds as many as fifty quotations from "In Memoriam" and fully as many more from others of Tennyson's poems. One comparison of Lee with King Arthur or Arthur Hallam is good, but to have the suggestion repeated constantly becomes tedious. A more serious defect is the tendency of the author to digress—a fact which gives rise to a looseness of structure in the book that is fatal. Where so much is to be said about Lee, one grudges the space given to the author's autobiography and to irrelevant reminiscences of his friends and comrades in war and peace. More serious still is the author's point of view which is as far removed as possible from the broad and catholic view of Mr. Adams. This is seen especially in the chapter entitled "If Lee Had Succeeded," in which regret that the Confederacy did not succeed mingles with pessimism as regards the present status of American social and political life. Never before has the unreconstructed Southerner's point of view been so bluntly expressed—certainly not since the days of Dr. Alfred T. Bledsoe. Such sentences as the following are typical: "With Lee fell the American republic: with the overthrow of self-government in the South, the death of constitutional freedom was in due time assured." "Every

distinctive and cardinal feature of our government as instituted and conserved by the masters of a former age—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Calhoun—has vanished since Lee surrendered the fragment of his hero band in the dawning spring of forty years ago." "We blind our eyes to the fact that we as a nation are passing into an imperialism more intense and pervading than that which Germany has developed since the unification of 1871." Nothing could be further removed from the spirit of Grady and Lamar than these words—and, it may be added, from that of the great Lee himself.

E. M.

FROM A COLLEGE WINDOW. By A. C. Benson. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906,—365 pp.

It has been a long time since anybody has written such delightful essays as are found in this volume. It is difficult to write with moderation, for on every page the reader feels that he has been admitted to intimate association with one of the most interesting men now writing the English language. Here there is some of the charm—though not the genius—of the gentle Elia or of the "Roundabout Papers." Not since Stevenson's volumes of essays has there been a more significant one than this. Charm and sincerity and "that subtle and evasive thing which is called personality,"—the prime requisites of the personal essay—are here.

The author, brought up in the distinctly intellectual and religious atmosphere of Archbishop Benson's home, a moderate scholar and a competent athlete at Cambridge, and later a fellow of Magdeline College, writes frankly of himself—"the little bit of experience which I call my life, which seems to me such a strange and often so bewildering a thing." Arnold has scarcely written about Oxford with more charm than does Mr. Benson about Cambridge. From his windows he looks upon "the green and sheltered garden, with its air of secluded recollection and repose, a place of quiet pacing to and fro, of sober and joyful musing; yet on another side I see the court, with all its fresh and shifting life, its swift interchange of study and activity; and on yet another side I can observe the streets where the infinite pag-eant of humanity goes to and fro, a tide full of sound and foam,

of business and laughter, and of sorrow, too, and sickness and the funeral pomp of death."

From this point of view then the author gives a worthy expression of what goes on in the college, in the world, and in his own soul. The subjects of his chapters indicate the range of his reflection: On Growing Older, Books, Conversation, Beauty, Art, Egotism, Authorship, The Criticism of Others, Priests, Games, Spiritualism, and Religion. He approaches all these subjects not from a strictly academic standpoint, for he is intensely human; nor from that of a worldly man, for he is genuinely religious; nor from that of the indifferentism which is like a blight on many college communities, for he is enthusiastic over what he likes. His style rich in literary allusion and in individuality has warmth and color the absence of which in contemporary writing makes us feel at times that we are living in another age of prose and reason.

E. M.

JOHN SHERMAN. By Theodore E. Burton. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1906,—viii., 449 pp.

It seems very fitting that the task of writing the biography of John Sherman should have been entrusted to Representative Theodore Burton, of Ohio. Mr. Burton's own praiseworthy participation in national legislative affairs has been of such a character as to qualify him in a high degree to write understandingly and appreciatively of the long and distinguished public career of one who was a fellow citizen of his State. In reading these pages, one is constantly impressed with the extraordinary importance and statesmanlike quality of the many and varied services which Sherman rendered to his country.

Sherman was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1854, soon after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. Though a new member, he at once came into prominence as a leader in the movement against the extension of slavery. In the Thirty-sixth Congress, which met in December, 1859, he was for many weeks the leading candidate of the Republican party in a prolonged contest over the speakership. His defeat has commonly been ascribed to an indorsement of the remarkable book written in North Carolina by Hinton R. Helper and entitled "The

Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet It." This book had been "proscribed in the South, but was found in every bookstall in the North." Mr. Sherman, however, was made chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and had an important part in securing the passage of the Morrill Tariff Act. Upon the election of Lincoln, Senator Chase, of Ohio, was called to be Secretary of the Treasury, and Sherman was chosen to fill the vacant seat in the Senate. He continued to occupy a seat in the Senate for sixteen years, was four years Secretary of the Treasury under President Hayes, was fortunately re-elected by the Ohio legislature to the Senate where he served a second period of sixteen years, and ended his public career by holding the position of Secretary of State in McKinley's Cabinet from March 5, 1897, to April 27, 1898.

Mr. Burton's sympathetic and friendly survey of Sherman's forty-three years of activity in high public office at Washington puts before us very clearly the importance of his work in connection with the enactment of such measures as affected the national financial and business interests. Among these were the Morrill Tariff Act, the Legal Tender Acts, the various tariff and internal revenue acts of the Civil War, the establishment of the national banking system, provisions affecting the currency and the public debt, the resumption of specie payments, measures affecting federal control of interstate commerce, the Anti-Trust Law, the Silver Purchase Law of 1890, and the McKinley Tariff Bill.

With regard to Sherman's candidacy for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1880, 1884, and 1888, Mr. Burton very justly points out that his career was not of a type to arouse popular enthusiasm, being concerned largely with the management of the government finances. However valuable his service, it was not "suited to awaken general acclaim." He had also the further disadvantage—often fatal to Presidential aspirants—of having taken a pronounced stand upon matters where there was a wide division of popular opinion.

In 1896 Sherman showed the effect of advancing years by certain lapses of memory during the campaign. Notwithstanding this fact he was persuaded to relinquish his seat in the Senate—to which Mr. Hanna was afterwards chosen—for the purpose of accepting the position of Secretary of State in McKinley's Cab-

net. It is probable that "in the Senate, where he was accustomed to the methods employed in the transaction of business, and where a certain consideration would have been shown for any infirmity due to advanced years, there would have been no serious handicap upon his usefulness until the end." As Secretary of State, his lack of bodily vigor and his serious failure of memory made it impossible for him to bear the responsibilities of his department in view of our growing difficulties with Spain. In the conduct of business, he was practically superseded by Mr. Day, Assistant Secretary of State. He left the Cabinet in the latter part of April, 1898, "with a degree of bitterness toward President McKinley, more by reason of his practical supersession than for any other reason; but also with a belief that he had been transferred to the Cabinet to make room for another in the Senate." However brought about, his retirement from the Senate had certainly been a grave mistake, and the painful circumstances resulting filled the last years of a most useful life with sadness and bitterness. He died on October 22, 1900. G.

THE TREASURE OF PEYRE GAILLARD. Being an account of the Recovery, on a South Carolina Plantation, of a Treasure, which had Remained Buried and Lost in a Vast Swamp for Over a Hundred Years. Arranged by John Bennett, after the Ms. Narrative by J. Buck Guignard, Esq. New York: The Century Company, 1907,—370 pp.

Southern life, manners, scenery from pre-revolutionary to recent time, all are often enough now-a-days the subject of novels and essays. The field is rich and attractive. That it is varied in points of interest Mr. Bennett would prove by making the ruin of an old family mansion built by a wealthy French settler near Charleston and partly destroyed by villainous Tories of the Revolution, and the life of his descendants down to several years ago, the background for a romantic story of the recovery of vast treasure hid and lost on the night of the Tory raid.

His book to be sure, is not altogether lacking in interest; in parts the narration is well done, and the reader follows the searching party led by the hero, Jack Gignillatt, with keen pleasure. The work, however, as a whole, is not great. There are many very evident faults of style, and most serious objections could easily be sustained against both plot and presentation.

For these obvious reasons Mr. Bennett's narrative fails in the first essential of such a story: the reader is never unconsciously in the firm but delightful grip of romantic illusion. First of all, Mr. Bennett hasn't the art to throw around the impossible the air of reality, to create poetically real unreality, as for example, Robert Louis Stevenson could in so gloriously delightful a way. He brings in too much everyday commonplace, and the magic spell, even in its incipency, is broken. Again, I suspect it is well-nigh impossible to invest a ruin of so few years with the romantic interest attaching to the mediæval castles of Europe. Besides who can accept even as romantic fact the story that the treasure as found amounted to nearly two million dollars in value, when we are told that the precious stones were examined and valued by amember of the well known firm of Allan & Company, of King Street, Charleston, S. C., and that the most costly ones were bought for such recent marriages as that of the daughter of the Duke of Connaught? We reject this as nonsense, for we know too well we should have heard only too much of such an incident. The author has given his fancy too local a habitation and a name, and the reader is deprived of the joy of believing.

W. H. W.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW: A SKETCH OF HIS LIFE. By Charles Eliot Norton. Together with Longfellow's Chief Autobiographical Poems. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1907,—121 pp.

This little volume is a worthy fruitage of the recent almost universal celebration of Longfellow's centennial. It may be said that no better short sketch of Longfellow has been written than this one by Professor Norton. He brings to the task a lifelong friendship for the author, an intimate knowledge of life in and about Cambridge, and a culture that pre-eminently fits him to be the interpreter of Longfellow's work. The essay is a model of simple, clear cut and yet interesting style. It is well that the author has brought together in one volume the poems of Longfellow that have a distinctly autobiographical character, and those which relate to his especial friends and to the places of his birth and abode. "Thus," as he says in the preface, "the little book gives the story of the Poet's life briefly narrated in prose by

a friend, and partially recorded in verse by himself." There are just enough footnotes to interpret the text. It is fortunate that this volume will later be added to the Riverside Literature Series, and so will be available for the thousands of children to whom Longfellow serves as a guide into the realms of poetry. E. M.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON. *English Men of Letters Series*. By George Edward Woodberry. New York and London: The Macmillan Company, 1907—205 pp.

Emerson belongs by all rights in the *English Men of Letters Series*, for his power as a writer and as a thinker has long been recognized in England as in this country. To many Englishmen, as to Matthew Arnold, he has been one of the "voices" of the nineteenth century. He is undoubtedly, as Mr. Woodberry says, "the only great mind that America has produced in literature." Hawthorne and Poe were undoubtedly greater artists, but Emerson has his place in the intellectual and spiritual history of mankind by reason both of the stimulating quality of his thought and the occasional excellence of his style. The judgment of the author of this volume is not likely to be reversed by any future generation of critics: "To those who live in the spirit, he will long be, as Arnold says, the friend; to the young and courageous he will be an elder brother in the tasks of life, and in whatever land he is read he will be the herald and attendant of change, the son and father of Revolution." It is always inspiring to read Emerson, and it is well to read him with so sane an interpreter as Mr. Woodberry.

After all that has been written on Emerson—and there has been much—the present volume will take its rank as altogether the most satisfactory short account of Emerson's life and as one of the most authoritative estimates of his genius. Mr. Woodberry combines a fine sense of literary values with genuine philosophical insight. Much of the criticism of Emerson has been deficient in this latter quality. The author treads confidently along the highways of modern religious thought. After all it must be said that Emerson's "Essays" are "not a book of knowledge, of science, of reason, of civilization and orderly development through the institutional life of man and the slow ascertainment of truth by

the hard joint labor of many minds; they are a book of religion." Mr. Woodberry is, from this standpoint, a more satisfactory critic of Emerson than Dr. Holmes. While sensible of the great significance of Emerson's work, he is alive to his deficiencies—his fondness for half truths, his blindness to the institutional side of life and society, his inability to reach a definite system of thought, his essential isolation from the men and movements of his time, his lack of the artistic sense, the looseness of the structure of his style. Space does not allow even a reasonable treatment of these points as developed by Mr. Woodberry with great insight and discrimination—and, it may be added, with distinction of style. A sentence in which he sums up Emerson may well serve to give his point of view: "He was not a great writer in the sense in which Bacon, Montaigne, or Pascal are great writers; but he was a writer of greatness of mind, just as he was not a great poet, but a poet with greatness of imagination." E. M.

SHAKSPERE'S COMPLETE WORKS. By William Allan Neilson. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1906,—1237 pp.

A stream of books on the foremost English poet is constantly pouring from the press, but during the past year or two the number has been uncommonly large. Of this large number the one most apt to make readers of Shakspeare is Professor Neilson's edition of the poet's works. This book takes its place at once as the best one-volume edition of Shakspeare in the language. The book contains a brief biographical sketch in which, with unusual precision, the known facts of the poet's life are kept apart from the myth of Shakspeare. Each play is preceded by a special introduction dealing with questions of date, authenticity, and sources; and the volume is furnished with a compact and adequate glossary at the end. Professor Neilson thus supplies everything in the way of critical apparatus that is needed by any intelligent reader of the plays of Shakspeare. The volume is not too bulky to be handily used, and the type though small is clear and altogether comfortable to the eye.

But Professor Neilson's chief contribution to critical scholarship lies in his construction of an independent text of Shakspeare, in the making of which he has availed himself of all the vast body

of Shaksperian criticism, adopting and in rare cases suggesting emendations where it is not possible to make sense of the text, but always keeping close to the folio and quarto readings. Mr. Neilson shows everywhere ample knowledge, discriminating taste, and admirable judgment.

W. P. F.

LIBERTY, UNION, AND DEMOCRACY. By Barrett Wendell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906,—327 pp.

This volume is made up of the four Lowell Institute lectures of 1905, entitled, respectively, "The National Character of America," "Liberty," "Union," and "Democracy." They had their origin in a portion of the course delivered by Professor Wendell some years ago before certain of the French universities. These particular lectures direct themselves to the vital topic of "the manner in which America has conceived and has responded to the political ideals most conscious and most potent during the one hundred and thirty years of our national history."

In brief, Professor Wendell concludes in his first lecture that there is a distinctively American national character, that it can be traced through a line of great men directly back to the New England Yankees of early colonial days, and that they got it from the Englishmen of the period before the revolution which overturned the throne of Charles the First. The fathers of New England, Mr. Wendell holds, were pre-revolutionary English idealists of a very precise kind; they were unreservedly "precisians of that peculiar sort commonly called Puritan." And certain essential elements of their character have become the distinctive elements of the American national character. In maintaining this thesis, Professor Wendell gives an illuminating analysis of the New England Puritan character, and he certainly establishes its great influence in the formation of much of what is most distinctive in American character. But has not his eye been too single to New England? Has he not underestimated the contribution of other sections, and of forces which have not been attributable to any section?

The other three lectures, which give title to the book, are strong disproof of the charge of materialism often made against Americans. They exhibit cherished political ideals in support of

which Americans have often shown themselves willing gladly to risk fortune and even life. Of these vital principles of our national existence, Mr. Wendell writes with great insight and suggestiveness. His lectures, though originally intended for a foreign audience, will aid any good American to gain for himself a clearer view of the content of political principles which he has loyally cherished, but often not clearly or definitely comprehended. G.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons have published a handsome edition of the writings of Mr. Thomas Nelson Page in twelve volumes. It is very appropriately called the Plantation Edition. A review of this edition and a general estimate of Mr. Page's work by Professor Charles W. Kent, of the University of Virginia, will appear in the next number of the *QUARTERLY*.

